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## PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION.

Tue present volume forms the fourth portion of my Commentary on St . Paul's Epistles, and contains an exposition of the important Epistles to the Philippians and Colossians, and of the graceful and touching Epistle to Pliilemon.

The notes will be found to reflect the same critical and grammatical characteristics, and to recognize the same principles of interpretation as those which I endeavored to follow in the earlier portions of this work, and on which the experiences slowly and laboriously acquired during this undertaking have taught me year by year more confidently to rely. There is, however, a slight amount of additional matter which it is perhaps desirable briefly to specify.

In the first place, I have been enabled to carry out more fully and completely a system of reference to the great versions of antiquity, and have spared no pains to approach a little more nearly to those fresh and clear, yet somewhat remote, well-heads of Christian interpretation. In the notes on the Pastoral Epistles it was my endeavor to place before the reader, in all more important passages, the interpretations adopted by the Syriac, Old Latin, ${ }^{1}$ and Gothic Versions. To these in the present volume I have added references to the Coptic (Memphitic) and Ethiopic Versions; to the former as found in the convenient and accessible edition of Bötticher, to the latter as found in Walton's Polyghott, but more especially and exclusively to the excellent edition of the Ethiopic New Testament by the late Mr. Pell Platt (1830), published by the Bible Society. These have been honestly and laboriously compared with the original; but, as in the preface to the Pastoral Epistles, so here again would I earnestly remind the reader that though I

[^0]have laboced unfinchingly, and have spared no pains faithfully to clicit the exact opinion of these ancient translators, I still am painfully conscious how very limited is my present knowledge, and many must needs be my errors anl misconceptions in languages where literary help is scanty, and in applications of them where I find myself at present unaided and alone. Poor, however, and insufficient as my contributions are, I still deem it necessary to offer them; for I have been not a little startled to find that even critical editors of the stamp of Tischendorf, ${ }^{1}$ have apparently not acquired even a rudimentary knowledge of several of the leading versions which they conspicuously quote : may more, that in many instances they have positively misrepresented the very readings which have been followed, and have allowed themselves to be misled by Latin translations, which, as my notes will passingly testify, are often sadly and even perversely incorrect. I fear, indeed, that I am bound to say that on the Latin translations attached to the now antiquated edition of the Coptic New Testament by Wilkins, from which Tischendorf appears to have derived his readings, little reliance can be placed; and on that attached to the Ethiopic Version in Walton's Polyglott even less, beeause not only as a translation is it inexact, but as a representative of the Ethiopic Version, worse than useless, as the text was derived from the valueless edition of $15 \not 58$ (Rome), which in its transfer to the Polyglott was recruited with a fresh stock of inaccuracies.

It is fair to say that in this latter version Tischendorf appears to have also used the amended translation of Bode, but even thus he is only able to place before the reader results derived from an approximately accurate translation of a careless reprint of a poor original ; and thus to give only inadequately and inaccurately the testimony of the ancient Ethiopic Church The really good and valuable edition of Pell Platt has lain unnoticed and unused, because it has not the convenient appendage of a Latin translation. The same remark applies to the edition of the Coptic Version by Schwartze and Bötticher, which, though differing considerably less from that of Wilkins than the Ethiopic of Platt from the Ethiopic of the Polyglott, is similarly devoid of a Latin translation, and has, in consequence, I fear, received proportionately little attention.

Under these circumstances, when our knowledge even of the true readings of these two versions is still so very limited, I do not shrink from offering my scanty contributions, which, though intentionally exegetical in character, may be found to some extent useful even to a critieal editor. Gladly, most gladly,

[^1]should I welcome other laborers into the same field, nor can I point out to students in these somewhat intractable languages a more really useful undertaking than a correct Latin translation of Platt's Ethiopic Version, and a similar translation of the portions of the Coptic New Testament published by Schwartze and his less competent successor.

I will here add, for the sake of those who may feel attracted towards these fields of labor, a few bibliographical notices, and a few records of my own limited experiences, as these may be of some passing aid to novices, and may serve as temporary finger-posts over tracks where the paths are not well-trodden, and the travellers but few.

In Coptic, I have used with great advantage the grammar of Archdeacon Tattam, and the lexicon of the same learned editor. The more recent lexicon of Peyron has, I believe, secured a greater reputation, and as a philological work seems deservedly to rank higher, but after using both, I have found that of Tattam more generally useful, and more practically available for elementary reading, and for arriving at the current meaning of words. The very valuable Coptic grammar of Schwartze cannot be dispensed with by any student who desires to penetrate into the philological recesses of that singular language, but as a grammar to be put into the hands of a beginner, it is of more than doubtful value.

In Ethiopic, the old grammar of Ludolph still maintains its ground. The author was a perfect Ethiopic enthusiast, and has zealously striven, by the most minute grammatical subdivisions, to leave no peculiarities in the Ethiopic language unnoticed and unexplained; the student, however, must not fail to exercise his judgment in a first reading, and be careful to confine himself to the general principles of the language, without embarrassing himself too much with the many exceptional characteristics which this difficult ${ }^{1}$ language presents. These leading principles, especially in the second edition, are sufficiently well-defined, and will easily be extracted by any reader of moderate sagacity and grammatical experience. The recent Ethiopic grammar of Dillmann has passed through my hands, but my acquaintance with it is far too limited to pronounce on it any opinion. As far as I could judge, it seems to be very similar to that of Schwartze in Coptic, and only calculated for the more mature and scientific student. With regard to lexicons, there is, $I$ believe, no better one than that of Ludolph (2d ed.). That of Castell, alluded to in the preface to the Pastoral Epistles, I have since found to be decidedly inferior.

I do venture then to express a humble hope, that even with no better

[^2]literary appliances than these, carnest men and thoughtful scholars may be induced to investigate patiently and carefully the interpretations of these ancient witnesses of the truth. Surely the opinion of men, who lived in such early ages of the Church as those to which the chief ancient versions may all be referred, cannot be deemed unvorthy of attention. Surely a version like the old Syriac, parts of which might almost have been in the hands of the last of the apostles, a venerable monument of almost equal antiquity like the Old Latin, a version so generally accurate as that of Ulfilas, ${ }^{1}$ a version so distinctive as that of the Coptic, and so laborious as Platt's Ethiopic, ${ }^{2}$ cannot safely be clisregarded in the exposition of a Divine Revelation, where antiquity has a just and reasonable claim on our attention, and where novelty and private interpretation can never be indulged in without some degree of uncertainty and peril.

With these three carthly aids, first, an accurate knowledge of Hellenic Greek ; secondly, the Greek commentators, and thirdly, the five or six principal ancient versions, we may (with humble prayer for the illuminating grace of the Eternal Spirit) address ourselves to the task of a critical exposition of the Covenant of Mercy; we may trust that, though often with clouded and holden eyes, we may yet be permitted to see and to recognize some sure and certain outlines of Divine Truth: but without any of these, or with one, or even two, to the exclusion of what remain, dare we hope that our interpretations will always be found free from uncertainties and inconsistencies, and will never exhibit the tinges of individual opinion, and the often estimable, but ever precarious, subjectivity of religious predilections?

I fear indeed that these remarks are but little in unison with popular views and popular aspirations; I fear that the patient lahor necessary to perform faithfully the duty of an interpreter is unwelcome to many of the forward spirits of our own times. To be referred to Greek Fathers when suasive annotations of a supposed freer spirit, and a more flexible theology claim from us a hearing; to be bidden to toil on amid ancient versions, when a rough and ready scholarship is vaunting its own independence and sufficiency; to weigh in the balance, to mark and to record the verging scale while religious prejudice is ever struggling to kick the beam, - all seems savorless, unnecessary, and impracticable. I fear such is the prevailing spirit of our own times; yet, amid all, I seem to myself to desery a spirit of graver

[^3]search wimning its way among us, a more determined allegiance to the truth, a greater tendency to snap the chains of sectarian bondage, and it is to those who feel themselves animated by this spirit, who are quickened by the desire at every cost to search out and to proclaim the truth, who think that there is no sacrifice too great, no labor too relentless, in the exposition of the word of God, - to them, and to such as them, I would fain, with all humility, commend the imperfect and initial efforts to elicit the testimony of the ancient versions which these pages contain, and it is from them that I hopefully look for corrections of the errors and inaccuracies into which my inexperience will, I fear, be often found to have betrayed me.

Another addition which I have striven to make, and which the profound importance of the subject has seemed to require, consists in the introduction of a few doctrinal comments upon the passages in these Epistles which relate to our Saviour's divinity; and this I trust no one will deem supererogatory. The strongly developed tendencies of our own times towards humanitarian conceptions of the nature and work of our divine Master, - tendencies often associated with great depth of feeling and tenderness of sympathy, - seem now to demand the serious attention of every thoughtful man. The signs of the times are very noticeable. The divinity of the Eternal Son is not now so much assailed by avowed heretical teaching, as diluted by more plausible, perhaps even more excusable, but certainly no less destructive and pernicious, developments of human error. The turmoil of Arian and semi-Arian strife has comparatively ceased, to be succeeded, however, by a more delusive calm, and a more dangerous and enervating repose. In the popular theology of the present day, the Eternal Son is presented to us under aspeets by no means calculated to rouse any active lostility or provoke any earnest antagonism. All is suasive and seductive : our Lord is claimed as united to us by human affinities of tonching yet precarious application; He is the prince of sufferers, the champion of dependence and depression, the representative of contested principles of social union; His crucifixion becomes the apotheosis of self-denial, the atonement the master work of a pure and sublimated sympathy, - all principles and aspects the more dangerous from involving admixtures of partial truth, the more harmful from their seeming harmlessness. It is against this more specious and subtle form of error that we have now to contend; it is this plausible and versatile theosophy that seeks to ensnare us by its appeal to our better feelings and warmer sympathies, that seems to edify while it perverts, that attracts while it ruins, that it is now the duty of every true servant of Jesus Christ to seek to expose and to countervail. And this can be done in no way more charitably, yet more effectually, than by simply setting forth with all sincerity, faithfulness, and truth, those portions of the word of life which declare the true nature of
the Eternal Son in language that no exegetical artifice can successfully exflain away, and against which Arian, semi-Arian, Deist, and Pantheist, have beaten out their strength in vain.

Under these feclings, then, in the important doctrinal passages in these Erisiles which relate to our Lord's divinity, I bave sparel no prains in the endeavor candidly and truthelly to state the meaning of every mord. and to Prat before the younger reader, in the form of sraopsis or quotation, the greas dormatical principles and deluctions which the early Greek and Latin Fathers, and more espevially our own Divines of the seventeenth and early part of the eighteenth century have unfobled with such nieck learning. such perspicuity, and such truth. I need scarcely remark that here I have had to rely soldy on my own reading: for in the works of the best German commeatators sound dogmatical theology will I fear too often be sought for in rain, and even in the more reoent pmoluctions of our own country; subjectire explanation and an inexast and somewhat diffluent theology: have been ailomed to displace the more accurate ani protound deductions of an earlier ciar. On this portion of my labors more than on any other may the Father of Lights be pleased to voucleate His blossing, and to overrule these efforts to issues beyond their own proper eficaer: and to uses which my carnest aspirations, but not my sense of their realization, have presumed to contemplate.

A few adlitions will le found in what may be termed the pl? ?o? oniva? portion of this Commentary. Therever the derivation of a word has seemed obseure. and an exact lanowledge of its fundamental msaning has seemed of importance to the passage, I have notel in lipackets its probable philological affinities, and stated. with all possible lorevity, the opinions of modern investigators in this recently explored domain of literature. Gladly mould I have found this done to my hand in the current lexicons of Eugland or Germany, as it would have saved me cot only much labor. bat many unweleome interruptions; but upon the philoloc: of modern lexions I regret to say rery little reliance can be placel. Eren in the otherwise almirable lexicon of Rost and Palm. which, I may here remark, is now brought to a completion, it is vexatious to observe hom much philolocty has been neerlocted by its compilers, and bow uncertain and precarious are the derivations of all the more difficult words.

With regard to references to former notes, which. now that my work has extended to eight Epistles, bare necessarily become some what numerous, I have endearored to observe the following rule. Where the reference has arpeared of less moment, I hare contentel myself with a simple allusion to the former note. Where the reference has seemed of geeater moment, and the note referred to contains any critical or grammatical investigations, I
hare generally endeavorel to embody briefly in the note before the reader the principhes previonsly disenssed. leaving the fuller detail to be sought for in the note referred to. Mry desire is thus to make each portion of this work as muth as possible an independeut whole. and while aroiding repetition still to olviate, as far as is comnatible with the nature of a continnous work, the necessity of the purchase or perusal of foregoing portions.

Ifew convluding words on the Translation. I hare more than once had ny attention called to passages in former commentaries, where the translation in the notes has not appeared in perfect unison with that in the Rerisel Tersion. In a few cases I fear this may hare arisen from an omission to correct the copry of the Authorized Tersion which lay beside me, but I believe in most instances these sceming discrepancies have arisen from the fact that the fired principles on which I renture to revise the Authorized Tersion do not always arlmit of an exact ilentity of language in the rersion and in the note. In a worl, the twanslation in the note presents what has been considered the most exact rembering of the womls taken $j$ as ; the Perised Tersion preserves that rewlering as far as is compatilie with the lof operis, the context, the idioms of our language or lastly, that grave and arehaic tone of our admiralle rersion which, even in a revisc l form of it designed only for the clowt. it seemel a kind of sacrilege to dieplace for the possibly more precise. ret often really less expressive phraseolory of modern diction. Needlessly to divonte the original and that rersion with which our ears are so familiar. and often our lighest associations aud purest sympathies so intimately bound, is an ill-consilered course, which more than anything else may tend to foster an unvokel spirit of scriptural sturly and translation, alike unfilial and presumptunus. and to which a modern reviser mar hereafter bitterly repent to have lent his example or his contributions.

I desire in the last place to record a few of my many ouligations. These. homerer. are somewhat less than in earlier portions of this work, as the great and unintermitting labor expeuled in the examination of the ancient rersions, esnecially the Coptic and Ethiopic, has left me little time. an\%. perhaps I might say little need, for consulting commentaries of a secondary rharacter. These it is not necessary to specity. but the student who mar miss their names on my present pages will. I truly believe. have gained far more from the ancient versions that have been adduced. than lost by the writers that have been left unnoticed.

Of the larger commentaries. I hare carefully and thoughtfully perused the excellent commentary of my friend. Dean Alford. From it I hare not derived much directly, as I decmed it best for the cause of that truth which We both humbly strive to advance, to consult for mrself the original aur thorities and various exeretical subsidies that were alike accessible to us
both, that so my adhesion to the opinions of my able predecessor, or my departure from them, might be the result of my own deliberate investigations. At the same time I have been particularly benefited by the admirable perspicuity of his notes, and have felt rejoiced when our opinions coincide, and unfeignedly sorry when I have deemed myself compelled to take a contrary or antagonistic side.

To the commentaries of De Wette and Meyer, but especially to those of the latter, I am, as heretofore, greatly indebted for grammatical and exegetical details, but in the dogmatical portions I have neither sought for nor derived any assistance whatever. To German commentaries the faithful and candid expositor of Scripture is under great obligations, but for theology, he must turn to the great doctrinal treatises of the Divines of our own country.

Of separate commentaries on the Plitippians, the learned and laborious production of Tau Hengel has been on many occasions extremely useful from its affluence of grammatical examples; but it is rather deficient in that brevity and perspicuity of critical discussion which is nowhere more indispensable than in the aggregation of parallel passages, and the comparison of supposed, but perhaps illusory, similarities of structure.

The commentary of Wiesinger is thoughtful and sensible, and not unfrequently distinguished by a sound and persuasive exegesis. Those of Rilliet and Hollemann, but especially the former, deserve consideration, but have been still so far superseded by more modern expositions, that it will in all cases be advisable for the student to read them with some degree of caution and suspended judgment.

Of commentaries on the Colossians, I must first specify the learned and exhaustive work of Bishop Davenant, which has certainly not received that attention from modern expositors which it so fully deserves. Its usefulness is somewhat interfered with by the scholastic form in which the notes are drawn up, nor is it free from the tinge of theological prejudice; but there is a thoroughess and completeness of exegetical investigation, which render it an exposition which no student of this profound Epistle will be wise to overlook.

Of modern commentaries, that of Huther will well repay the trouble of perusal, but both this work and that of Bähr have been so thoroughly examined by De Wrette and Meyer, and in many passages so assimilated and incorporated, that a separate study of them is rendered somewhat less necessary. They will, however, always be referred to with advantage, but this should not be apart from a consideration of the opinions of their successors, and of the various rectifications which a more accurate scholarship has occasionally been found to suggest.

The commentary of Professor Eadic has been of occasional service to me; but, as in the commentary on the Ephesians, so here also I fear I am com-
pelled in candor to say，that the grammatical comments do not always appear quite exact，nor are the doctrinal passages always discussed with that calm precision and dignified simplicity of language which these subjects seem to require and suggest；still most of the exegetical portion is extremely good， nor will any reader rise from the study of this learned，earnest，and not un－ frequently eloquent volume，unimproved either in head or in heart．

Notices of the other and larger commentaries on the New Testament，or on St．Paul＇s Epistles，to which I have been in the habit of referring，will be found in the prefaces to the preceding portions of this work．

It now only remains for me to commit this volume to the reader，with the earnest prayer to Almighty God that he，who has so mercifully sustained me with health and strength during the anxieties of continued research and the pressure of protracted labor，may be pleased to grant that this research may not prove wholly fruitless，this labor not utterly in vain．

> TPIA乏, MONA乏, 'EAEHエON.

Cambridge，October 20， 1857.

## PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION.

The second edition of this portion of my labors is now at length presented to the reader. Like the second edition of the portion which preceded, the Pastoral Epistles, it has been delayed till time could be found for calmly and deliberately reviewing and reconsidering the whole work.

This duty has now been performed. Every portion of the commentary has been read over; every interpretation has been tested; and, I might almost add, every citation of Scripture has been examined and verified anew. For this labor, which has occupied a considerable portion of the past summer, there is but little to show. The book remains nearly in all its details as well as in its larger features exactly what it was. A very few readings, and those unimportant, have been changed; a certain number of alterations have been introduced in the Revised Translation; a small number of references to standard sermons, which had been either overlooked or not known when the commentary was written, are now added; and lastly, a short introduction has been prefixed to each one of the three Epistles that are included in this volume.

This I fear is all that I have to show for the time spent in preparing this edition. Yet perhaps that time has not been spent wholly in vain. It now enables me, with all humility, and with a thorough consciousness of my own imperfections and shortcomings, yet with some measures of chastened confidence, to commend to the reader the interpretations of the many great doctrinal passages, - especially those bearing on the Majesty and Divinity of our adorable Lord, - which he will find in the first two of the portions of Holy Scripture contained in this volume. Those interpretations (which, let it be observed, are nearly in every case those of the early versions or Greek commentators, stated only in a little more precise and technical language) have been again carefully tested. The accuracies of modern scholarship have been anew brought to bear upon them, the finesse and ingenuity of modern exegesis have been freely applied to the passages which they expound to us; and the result is that these ancient interpretations appear to have as strong claim upon our attention as ever, and, in an age of unlicensed
criticism and sadly deceitful dealings with the word of God, to stand forth as examples of what the meek wisdom of earlier days regarded as the true and accurate method of expounding the message of salvation.

If such be the result of these present labors, - if the renewed testimony of one humble witness may be permitted in any degree effectually to warn the young and the earnest from rash and unblest modes of Scriptural interpretation; if these pages may be thought in some measure to show that the deductions of rigorous scholarship and of catholic truth stand ever in the truest union, - then I shall humbly and devoutly rejoice, and bless God that amid many recent hinderances and distractions I have been thus enabled carefully to revise and calmly to reconsider a very important portion of my labors, and thus to commend it with renewed confidence to the Christian student.

May the blessing of the Father of Lights rest on all readers and expounders of his inspired Word, and move us all, in these proud and dangerous days, to yield up our high thoughts unto him who 'of God is made unto us wisdom,' and to determine, even as an inspired apostle determined amid the sceptical disputauts of his own times, 'not to know anything save Jesus Christ and Him crucified.'

C. J. ELLICOTT.

Exeter, SEPtenber, 1861.

## INTRODUCTION.

This fervent, affectionate, and, in parts, pathetic Epistle was written by the apostle to his liberal and warmhearted converts in the Roman colony of Philippi, towards the close of his first captivity at Rome (see Introd. to 1 Tim.), and at a time when, it would seem, his imprisonment was of a closer and harsher character, and his earthly prospects, though not by any means without hope (ch. i. 25,26 ; ii. 24 ), yet, in many respects, cheerless and depressing (ch. i. 20 sq., ii. 17,28 ). Ii has thus been supposed, with some probability, to have been written after the death of the Protorian Prefect (Burrus) to whom the apostle had been at first entrusted (Acts xxviii. 16), and by whom, as we may infer from Acts l.c., he had been treated with leniency and consideration.

As the death of Burrus took place in A. D. 62 (Clinton, Fasti Rom. Vol. I. p. 44), and as there are some expressions in the Epistle that seem distinctly to imply that the captivity had been of some duration (ch. i. 13 sq., comp. ii. 26), we may fix the date of the Epistle towards the close of, or more probably about the middle of, A. D. 63, and may thus place it as the last in order of the four Epistles written during the first captivity at Rome: see Davidson, Introd. Vol. II. p. 373.

The circumstances that gave rise to the Epistle appear to have been simply the fact of Epaphroditus having come from the Church of Philippi with contributions to alleviate the necessities of the captive apostle, - contributions which, as we learn from the Epistle itself (ch. iv. 15, 16; compare 2 Cor. xi. 9), this liberal Church had promptly sent on other and earlier occasions. Moved by this fresh proof of love evinced by his dearly-beloved Philippians, - his 'joy and crown' as he affectionately terms them (ch.iv. 1),
the apostle avails himself of the return of Epaphroditus, who now, after a dangerous illness (ch.ii. 27), was on his way back to Philippi, to send to that Church and its chief officers (ch. i. 1; see notes in loc.) by the hand of their own messenger, his warm and affectionate thanks, mingled with personal notices relative to his own state, earnest commendations, pointed but kindly warnings, and varied expressions of consolation and encouragement. No Epistle written by the inspired apostle is pervaded with a loftier tone of cheering exhortation (see notes on ch. iii. 1) ; none in which the pressing forward for 'the prize of the ligh calling of God in Christ Jesus' is set forth in language of greater animation ; none in which imitation of his own love of his Master is urged upon his converts in strains of holier incen11 tive (compare ch. iii. 17-21). The supposition that there were definite parties and factions in the Church of Philippi, and that the Epistle was designed to expose their errors, and especially those of the Judaists, does not seem tenable. It is clear that Judaizing teachers had intruded into the Church of Philippi (ch. iii. 2), but it seems also clear that their teaching had (' at present met with but little reception.

The genuineness and cuthenticity of the Epistle are very convincingly demonstrated by external testimony (Polycarp, ad Plilipp. cap. 3, Irenæus, Heer. Iv. 34, ed. Grabe, Clem.-Alex. Pcedag. I. p. 129, ed. Pott., Tertull. de Incurr. Carn. eap. 25), and even more so by the individuality of tone and langnage. Doubts have been urged by a few modern writers, but they have been justly pronounced by all competent crities as wholly unworthy of attention. The same may be said of the doubts as to the unity of the Epistle: see Davidson, Introd. Vol. II. p. 387 sq.

# TIE EPISTLE TO TIIE PIIILIPPIANS. 

## CHAPTER I.

Apostolic nddress and salutation.

П



1. $\kappa$ al $T \iota \mu$ ón ©os] Timothy is here associated with the apostle (as in 2 Cor. i. 1, Col. i. 1, 1 and 2 Thess. i. 1), being known to, and probably esteemed by, the Philippians (Grot.), whom he had already twice visited; once in company with St. Paul (Acts xvi. 1, 12), and once alone ( 1 cts xix. 22). The association scems similar to that with Sosthenes, 1 Cor. i. 1; Timothy being neither the joint author of the Epistle (Menoch.), nor the 'comprobator' of its contents (Zanch. ; comp, notes on Gal. i. 2), nor again the mere transcriber of it (comp. Rom. xvi. 22), but simply the 'socius salutationis,' Est. Two verses lower the apostle proceeds in his own person, and in ch. ii. 19, when Timothy reappears, it is simply in the third person. may be remarked that it is only in this Ep., 1 and 2 Thess., and, as we might expect, Philem., that St. Paul omits his oficial designation, àmó $\sigma \tau 0 \lambda$ os к. $\tau, \lambda$. (Gal. i. 1 ), or $\alpha \pi \delta \sigma \tau$. ${ }^{'} \eta \sigma$. X $\rho$. (remaining Epp.). This seems due, not to ' modestia' in the choice of a title common to himself and Tim. (Grot.), for sec 2 Cor. i. 1, Col. i. 1, but simply to the terms of affection and familiarity on which he stood with the churches both of Thessalonica (ch. ii. 19, 20, iii. 6-
10) and Philippi : he was their apostle, and he knew from their acts (Phil. iv. 14 sq.) and their wishes (l Thess. iii. 6) that they regarded him as such. On the modes of salutation adopted by St. Paul, see Rückert on Gal. i. 1, and compare notes on Eph. i. 1, and on Col. i. 1. סov̂גot X. 'I.] 'bond-servants of Jesus Christ ;' 'servi proprie crant qui toti obstricti crant Domino in perpetuum,' Zancl. ap. Pol. Syn.; so Rom. i. 1 ; compare Gal. i. 10, and also James i. 1, 2 Pet. i. 1, Jude 1. The interpretation of Fritzsche (Rom. i. 1), 'Jesu Christi cultor,' scil. 'homo Christianus,' is tenable (compare Dan. iii. 26), but like so many of that commentator's interpretations, hopelessly frigid; comp. Gal. i. 10 , where to translate X $\rho$. Soû̀os ov̀k ầ $\nu$ ऊu unv, 'non essem homo Christianus,' is to impair all the vigor of the passage. The term is usel in its ethical, rather than mere historical sense, 'an apostle,' etc. (sce Mcyer on Gal. l. c.), and the genitive is strongly possessive : they belonged to Christ as to a master, comp. 1 Cor. vii. 22: His they were; yea, His very marks they bore on their bodies; compare Gal. vi. 17, and see notes inloc. The formula סoûגos $\Theta \in o \hat{v}$ (comp, Hinn Ps. cxiii. 1, al.) is naturally moro

## 

general ; סoû入os Xpıбтô̂, somervhat more personal and special: compare notes on Titi. 1. $\quad \pi \hat{\alpha} \sigma \iota \nu$ tंois $\dot{\alpha} \gamma$ [ots к. $\tau . \lambda$.$] 'to all the saints,' etc.,$ 'to all that form part of the visible and spiritual community at Philippi ;' $\alpha$ yıo being used in these salutations in its most inclusive sense : sce notes on Eph. i. 1. 'Though äyos in these sorts of addresses does not necessarily imply any special degree of moral perfection, being applied by the apostle to all his converts, except the Gal. (and apparently Thess., oirious in ch. v. 27 being very doubtful), yet still the remark of Olsh. (on Rom. i. i) is probably true, that it always hints at the idea of a higher moral life imparted by Christ. This in the present case is made still more apparent by the addlition èv X P เб $\tau \hat{\omega}$ : it was ' in Him' (not for old́, Est, IRheinw.), in union with Him, and Him alone, that the doytót $\begin{gathered}\text { s } \\ \text { was }\end{gathered}$ true and real ; oi $\gamma$ à $\rho$ є่ $\nu \mathrm{X} \rho$. 'I $\eta \sigma$. ä $\gamma$ to九 üvtws ciolv, Theophyl. : compare Koch on Thessalon. i. 1, p. 59. The inclusive $\pi$ â $\sigma \iota \nu$, repeated several times in this Ep., ch. i. $4,7,8,25$, ii. 17,26 , iv. 23 (Rec.), well expresses the warmth and expansiveness of the apostle's love.
$\Phi: \lambda\{\pi \pi 0 / 5]$ Philippi, now Filibah or Filibejih, and anciently Kph̆ıòes (not á́tos, Van Heng. after Appian, Bell. Civ. 1v. 106, which was the ancient name of the port, Neapolis), was raised to a position of importance by Philip of Macedon about B. с. 358 , and called after his name. In later times it was memorable as overlooking the scene of the battle between Antony and Octavius against Brutus and Cassius, when the cause of the republic was finally lost (Merivale, Hist. Vol. III. p. 208) : soon afterwards it became a Roman colony (Colon. August. Julia Philippensis) and received the 'Jus Italicum.' It was, however, still more memorable as being the first
city in our continent of Europe in which the gospel was preached, Acts xvi. 9. A few ruins are said still to remain ; see Forbiger, Alt. Geogr. Vol. 1ir. p. 1070, and the axticle by the same author in Pauly, Encyl. Vol. v. p. 1477; compare also Leakc, N. Greece, Vol. iII. p. 216. $\sigma \grave{v} \nu$ '̇ $\pi \iota \sigma \kappa . \kappa \alpha l . \delta \iota a \kappa$.] ' together' with the bishops and deacons;' not merely 'in company with' ( $\mu \in \tau$ d'), but 'together with ' ('una cum,' Beza), - specially included in the same friendly greeting; compare notes on Eph. vi. 23. Various reasons have been assigned why special mention is made of these church-officers. The tivo most plausible seem, (a) because there were tendencies to division and disunion even among the Philippians, which rendered a notice of formally constituted church-officers not unsuitable (Wiesinger, al.) ; (b) because the e'miok. and סıák. liad naturally been the principal instruments in collecting the alms (Chrys., Theoph., and recently Meyer, Bisping). The latter seems most probable ; at any rate the date of the Epistle is not enough to account for the addition (Alf.), nor does the position of the clause warrant any contrast with ' the hicrarchical views' (ib.) of the Apost. Ff. (now by no means critically certain); for compare Ignatius (?) Philad. I:- the shepherds naturally follow the sheep. On the meaning of the title of office, ėлiбкотos, here appy. perfectly interchangeable with the title of age and dignity, $\pi \rho \in \sigma B u$. $\tau \in \rho o s$ (Acts xx. 17, 28, 1 Pet. v. 1), see especially notes on 1 Tim. iii. 1 ; and on סták. see notes on ib. iii. 8. The reading of $\mathrm{B}^{2} \mathrm{D}^{3} ; 39,67$, $\sigma v \nu \in \pi \iota \sigma \kappa \delta \dot{\pi o t s}$, retained and noticed by Chrys., seems meaningless and indefensible, and arose probably from the epistolary style of later times ; comp. Chrys. in loc.
2. $\chi$ d́ $\rho$ เs $\dot{\nu} \mu \hat{\imath} \nu \kappa . \tau . \lambda$.] On the spiritual significance of this blended form of

##  X

 ent fellowship in the gospel, and my love makes me confident for the future. May ye abound yet more and more.

Occidental and Oriental salutation, see notes on Gal. i. 2, and on Ephes. i. 2 ; comp. also Koch on 1 Thess. p. 60. The formula is substantially the same in all St. Paul's Epistles, except in Col. i. 2, and 1 Thess. i. 1, where the reading is doubtful. In the former, kal Kvp. ' $1 \eta \sigma$ $\mathrm{X} \rho$. seems certainly an insertion, and in the latter (the apostlo's earliest Epistle) it may be doubted whether the simple $\chi$ dapts кal eiphym, withont any further addition, may not be the more probable reading; see, however, Tisch. in loc.
 The Socinian interpr. ral ( $\pi a \tau \rho \partial s$ ) Kupíov, found also in Erasm. on Rom. i. 7, is rendered highly improbable by the use of the same formula without $\dot{\eta} \mu \omega \nu, 2 \mathrm{Tim}$. i. 2, Tit. i. 4, most p:obably 1 Tim. i. 2, and perhaps 2 Thess. i. 2: compare 1 Thess. iii. 11, 2 Thess. ii. 16.
3. є่े $\chi \alpha \rho\lrcorner \sigma \tau \bar{\omega}$ к. $\tau . \lambda$.] A closcly similar form of commencement occurs in Rom. i. 9,1 Cor. i. 4 , Philem. 4 ; compare also Eph. i. 16, Col. i. 3, I Thess. i. 2. Indeed in all his Epp. to churches, with the single and sad exception of that to the Galat., the apostle either returns thanks to God, or blesses Him, for the spiritual state of his converts; toùto ò
 and, Chrys. The present use of eivxaproteî̀ ('quod pro gratias agere ante Polybium' usurpavit nemo,' Lobeck) is condemned by the Atticists; see Lobeck, Phayn. p. 18, Thom. M. p. 913 (ed. Bern.), Herodian, p. 400 (ed. Koch), but consider Demosth. de Cor. p. 257. Pollux (Onom. v. 141) admits it for oitón val $\chi$ ápıs, but condemns it for eiòévat $\chi$ d́piv; see, however, Boeckh, Corp. Inscr. Vol. I. p. 52, and notes on Col. i. 12.
$\tau \hat{\omega}$ © $\epsilon \hat{\omega} \mu \circ \nu]$ So Rom. i. 8 ; compare Acts xxvii. 23, ồ єi $\mu \mathfrak{i} \$$ § kal $\lambda a \tau \rho \in \dot{\omega} \omega$. 'Significat Paulus quanta fiducia vero Deo adhæreat. Sunt enim qui sentiunt Deum misericordem quidem esse per Christum Sanctis hominibus nescio quibus, non autem sentiunt Deum ipsis esse misericordem,' Calv.
$\dot{\epsilon} \pi\} \pi \dot{\alpha} \sigma \eta \tau \hat{\eta} \mu \nu \in\{a]$ ' on the whole of my remembrance of you,' not 'every remembrance,' Auth. (but not the older Finglish Vv.), Bloomf., Conyb., and others, - a translation incompatible with the use of the art.; comp. Winer, Gr. § 18. 4, p. 101. The prep. $\bar{\pi} \pi l$ with the dative (which we can hardly say 'answers to the same prep. with a gen.; Rom. i. 10, Eph. i. 16,' Alf.) is not here temporal
 Chrys., Winer, Gir. p. 350, - a meaning favored by the incorrect interpr. of $\pi \dot{\alpha} a n$ $\tau \hat{\eta} \mu \nu$, but semilocal, and correctly expresses the idea of close and complete connection, ' my giving thanks is based upon my remembrance of you,' 'remembrance and gratitude are bound up together, (comp. Isaiah xxvi. 8), the primary idea bcing, not addition (Alf.), but superposition, Donalds. Cratyl. \$ 172, Gram. § 483: sec notes on ch. iii. 9, and on Eph. ii. 20 , whore (ed. 1) interchange the accidentally transposed 'former' and 'latter.' In Rom. i. 10, and Eph. i. 16 (see notes), where $\bar{\epsilon} \pi l$ is used with the gen. in a very similar sentence, a certain amount of tetnporal force seems fairly recognizable. The causal meaning, 'de eo quod vos mei recordamini,' Homberg, Michael., al. (comp. 1 Cor. i. 4), according to which $\hat{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ is a gen. subjecti, is exegetically untenable, as ver. 5 gives the reason for the evxap., and specifies


something which far more naturally clicited it. $\quad \mu \nu \in i ́ a \dot{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu]$ ' $r e-$ membrance of you,' 1 Thess. iii. 6, 2 'Tim. i. 3; not 'commemorationem vestri' (Van Hengel), - a meaning which, as Meyer rightly ubserves, it only receives when associated with $\pi 0 \iota \in \hat{i} \sigma \hat{\sim} a l$; compare Rom. i. 9, Eph. i. 16, 1 Thess. i. 2, Philem. 4.
4. $\pi \alpha ́ \nu \tau o \tau \epsilon-\pi 0<0$ v́ $\mu \in \nu o s]$ Participial sentence defining and explaining more fully when the eủ $\chi a p เ \sigma \tau \hat{\omega} \kappa . \tau . \lambda$. takes place, viz., on every occasion that he prayed for them : the ej $\chi$ apotoía was based on, and inseparable from the $\mu \nu \in i ́ a$, and this thankful remembrance ever found an utterance in every prayer. חávzote is clearly not to be joined with є $\cup \chi a p \iota \sigma \tau \hat{\omega}$ (Wiesing.), -a construction which interferes with the studied and affectionate cumulation $\pi \alpha ́ \nu \tau o \tau \epsilon, \pi \alpha ́ \sigma \eta$, $\pi \alpha \dot{d} \tau \omega \nu$ (comp. 2 Cor. is. 8) in the participial clause ; compare Col. i. 3, where it also seems best (contr. Meyer, De W.; see notes) to join the adverb with the participle. It may be remarked that no inference can be drawn from the position of mávтотє (a favorite word with the apostle), it being as often used by him after as before the verb with which it is connected: in the other writers of the N. T. (except John viii. 29, where it is emplatic) it precedes the verb. On the emphatic repetition, $\pi \alpha ́ \nu \tau 0 \tau \epsilon, \pi \alpha ́ \sigma \eta, \pi \alpha ́ \nu-$ $\tau \omega \nu$, see the copious list of examples in Lobeck, Paralip. p. 51 sq.
$\dot{v} \pi \dot{\epsilon} \rho \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \omega \nu \dot{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu]$. These words may be connected either (a) with tì $\nu$ ס́́ $\eta \sigma \iota \nu$ тоьоч́ $\mu \in r^{\prime} o s$, Calv., De Wette, Alf., al., or (b) with $\delta \in \eta \in \in \in \mu 0 v$, Auth. and all Engl. Vv., Meyer, al. Both are grammatically tenable; the omission of the article before $\dot{i} \pi \in \dot{\epsilon} \rho \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \omega \nu$ being perfectly justifiable in the first case (see notes on Eph: i. 15), and according to rule in the
second; see Winer, Gri. § 20. 4, p. 126. The latter, however, seems much more
 fined by $\pi \dot{\alpha} \sigma \eta \quad \delta \epsilon \eta \eta \sigma \epsilon$, and $\pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \sigma \eta \delta$. again is limited by $\dot{v} \pi \epsilon \frac{\varepsilon}{\dot{v}} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$, while the article attached to $\delta$ ' $\eta \sigma \iota \nu$ (Alf. seems here to argue against himself; compare with Meyer) refers it back to the $\delta$ '́ $\eta \sigma$ ts thus previously limited: so most of the ancient Vr., Syr., Clarom., Vulg.; Coptic. The construction adopted by Est., al.,
 where adopted by St. Paul (Eph. i. 16, comp. Rom. i. 8, 1 Thess. i. 2, 2 Thess. i. 3), seems here very unsatisfactory. On the meaning of $\delta \in \neq \eta \sigma t s$ (a special form of $\pi \rho o \sigma \in u \chi$ ń), sce notes on 1 Tim. ii. 1.
$\mu \in \tau \grave{\alpha} \chi \alpha \rho a \bar{c}]$ These words serve to depiet the feelings he bore to his children in the faith at Philippi ; he prays for them alway, yea, and he prays with joy;
 $\sigma \eta s^{\text {E }} \mu \pi i \prime \mu \pi \lambda a \mu a l$, Theodorct.
5. غ่ $\pi$ ! T $\hat{\eta}$ кoเv $\omega \nu$ \{ $\alpha]$ 'for your fellowship;' èri correctly marking the cause for which the apostle returned thanks, 1 Cor. i. 4, 2 Cor. ix. 15 ; see Winer, Gr. § 48. c, p. 351. This clause is most naturally connected with ejuap. (Beng., al., and apparently Greek commentt.), not with $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ ס́é $\eta \sigma . \pi$ тoooú $\mu$. (Van Heng., De W. ; compare Green, Gr. p. 292), as there would otherwise be no specific statement of what was the subject of the apostle's єùXapıotía. De Wette urges as an objection the use of $\epsilon \dot{\jmath} \chi a \rho . \dot{\epsilon} \pi l$ in two different senses, in ver. 3 and 5 , but this may be diluted by observing that the first $\dot{\epsilon} \pi l$ is not (as with De W.) temporal, but semilocal (ethico-local), defining the subject on which the thanks rest, and with which they are closely united, the difference between which and the present simply ethical use is but slight. Thus then rer: 3 marks the object on which the
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cuxap. rests, ver. 4 defines when it takes place, ver. 5 why it takes place. Such slightly varied and delicate uses of prepositions are certainly not strange to the style of St. Paul.
$\kappa 0 \iota \nu \omega \nu\{a \in$ is тò є $\dot{\nu} \alpha \gamma \gamma$.] 'fellouship toward the gospel;' not ' in the gospel,' Syr., Vulg. (but not Clarom.), but 'in reference to,' or perhaps more strictly 'toward' (Humm.), the cis marking the object toward which the kotvwria was directed (Winer, Gr. § 49. a, p. 353), the fellowship of faith and love which they evinced toward the gospel primarily and generally in their concordant action in the furtherance of it, and sccondurily and specially in their contribution and assistance to St. Paul. So in effect Chrysostom, ăpa тঠ $\sigma v \nu a \nu \tau i \lambda a \mu \beta \alpha \dot{\alpha} \in \sigma \hat{*} a \iota$
 that he too much limits the $\sigma v \nu \alpha \nu \tau t \lambda \alpha \mu \beta$. to the particular assistance rendered to the apostle (so Theophyl., Bisping.), which rather appears involved in, than directly conveyed by, the expression. On the other hand, the absence of the article before eis $\tau \boldsymbol{\text { o }}$ euary., which confessedly involves the close connection of кoเv. and єis $\tau \delta$ єن̉ay. (Winer, Gr. § 20. 2, p. 123, comp. ch. iv. 15), coupled with the exeretical consideration, that in an epistle which elsewhere so especially commemorates the liberality of the Philippians (ch. iv. 10, 15, 16), such an allusion at the outset would be both natural and probable (comp. De W.), renders it difficult with Mey. and Alf. to restrict кoเv.vía merely to 'unanimous action' (Alf:), 'bon accord' (Rilliet), and not to include that particular manifestation of it which so especially marked the libcral and warm-hearted Christians of Philippi ; compare Wiesing. in loc., and Neander, Phil. p. 25. Kolvตvía is thus absolute (Acts ii. 42, Gal. ii. 9) and abstract, - 'fellowship,' not ' contribution'
(Bisp.), a translation which is defensible (see Fritz. on Rom. xv. 26, Vol. 1ir. p. 287), but which would mar the studiedly general character of the expression. The interpretation of Theod. (not Chrysost.), al., according to which єis $\tau \dot{\partial} \epsilon \dot{\nu} a \gamma \gamma$. is a periphrasis for a gen. (кoıvんvíav ठो toû $\epsilon \dot{\jmath} \alpha \gamma \gamma \cdot \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \pi i \sigma \tau \iota \nu$ éká $\lambda \epsilon \sigma \epsilon$ ), is grammatically untenable ; compare Winer, Gr. § 30. $5, \mathrm{p} .174$. $\dot{\alpha} \pi \delta \pi \rho \omega \bar{\omega} \tau \mathrm{s}$ $\dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon$ 'िas] 'from the first day,' in which it was preached among them ( $\dot{\alpha} \phi^{3}$ o $\hat{i}$ ̇̇ँıбтєט́бarє, Theophyl.), Acts xvi. 13 sq., comp. Col. i. 6. This clause, which scems so obviously in close union with the preceling words, is connected by Lachm. (ed. stereot., but altered in larger ed.) and Meyer with $\pi \in \pi o เ ง \omega \omega$ к. $\tau$. $\lambda$., on account of the absence of the article. This is hypercriticism, if not error ; àmò трผ́тทs к. $\tau_{.} \lambda_{0}$ is a subordinate temporal definition so closely joined with the rolvavia, as both naturally and logically to dispense with the article. The insertion of the article would give the fact of the duration of the koivavía a far greater prominence than the apostle seems to have intended, and would in fact suggest two moments of thought, - 'communionem camque a primâ die,' etc. ; comp. Winer, Gir. § 20. 2, and notes on 1 Tim. i. 13. Even independently of these grammatical objections, the use of $\pi \epsilon$ $\pi 01 \approx a$, which De Wette and Yan Heng. remark is usually placed by St. Paul first in the sentence (ch. ii. 24, Rom: ii. 19, 2 Cor. ii. 3, Gal. v. 10, 2 Thess. iii. 4), would certainly seem to suggest for the participle a more prominent position in the sentence. The connection with $\epsilon \dot{v}$ $\chi$ áp. (Ecum., Beza, Beng.) seems equally untenable and unsatisfactory ; such a temporal limitation could not suitably be so distant from its finite verb, nor would む̀ $\pi \grave{\partial} \pi \rho \omega \dot{\tau} \eta \mathrm{s}$ к. $\tau . \lambda$. be in harmony with the pres. ev̉xap., or the prior temporal
clause mávтote к. $\tau . \lambda$. ; compare De Wette.
6. $\pi \in \pi 0 \operatorname{ti} \omega \mathrm{~s} \alpha \mathrm{v} \tau \delta \tau 0 \hat{v} \tau 0]$ 'being confident of this very thing, viz., that He who,' cte., comp. Col. iv. 8 ; not 'confident as I am,' Alford (comp. P'eile), but with the faint causal force so often couched in the participle, 'secing I am, etc. ;' ' hæc fiducia nervus est gratiarum actionis,' Beng. This clause is thus, grammatically considered, the causal member of the sentence (Donalds. Gri. § 615) appended to єủ $\alpha p \iota \sigma \tau \bar{\omega} \kappa$ к. т. $\lambda$., standing in parallelism to the temporal member,
 tainly requires no supplementary kal (Tynd., Flatt, al.), nor any assumption of an asyndeton (Van Heng.). The accus. aủтд тov̂тo is not governed by $\pi \epsilon-$ пotiós (Raphel, Wolf), but is appended to it as specially marking the 'content and compass of the action' (Madvig, Synt. § 27. a), or, more exactly, 'the object in reference to which the action extends' (Krüger, Sprachl. § 46. 4. 1 sq.), which again is more fully defined by the following of oft к. т. $\lambda$. ; comp. Winer, Gro § 23. 5, p. 145, where several examples of this construction are cited. It is mainly confined to St. John and St. Paul, and scrves to direct the attention somewhat specially to what follows; compare Ellendt, Lex. Soph. Vol. ir. p. 461.
$\delta \quad \epsilon \nu \alpha \rho \xi \alpha \mu \in \nu o s]$
'He who hath begun;' obviously God: see ch. ii. 13, and comp. 1 Sam. iii. 12,
 one of the Philippians' (Wakef. Sylv. Crit. Vol. 11. p. 98), - an interpretation
 below) need in no way compel us. The rerb ėvápx. occurs again in counection with è $\pi / \tau \in \lambda$. in Gal. iii. 3, and 2 Cor. viii. 6 (Lachm., but only with B). The compound verb does not appear to mark the ' vim divinam hominum in animis agen-
tem,' Van Meng. (for see Gal. l.c., and comp. Polyb. Hist. v. 1. 3, 5), but perhaps only differs from äp $\rho \in \sigma$ 大at in this, tiat it represents the action of the verb as more directly concentrated on the object, whether (as here) expressed, or understood; sce Rost u. Palm, Lex. s. v. $\epsilon \epsilon^{\prime} \nu$, e, Vol. 1. p. 912.
ย่ $\nu$ vi $\mu \hat{\iota} \nu]$ ' in you,' sc. 'in animis vestris,' compare 1 Cor. xii. 6 ; not 'among you,' Hamm., which would scarcely be
 7. The commencement of the good work was not limited to instances among the Philippian Christians, but was spoken gencrally in reference to all.
द́p 'the good work,' Luth. : not elsewhere used in ref. to God (yet comp. John x. 32), but only in ref. to man ; compare Acts ix. 36, Rom. ii. 7, 2 Cor. ix. 8 , Eph. ii. 10, Col. i. 10, Heb. xiii. 21, al. Still there is no impropriety in the present use ; the ${ }^{\epsilon} p \gamma o v$ à ${ }^{2}$ antov, though here stated indefinitely, docs not appear to refor subjectively to the good works (Syr. ;
 $\pi i \sigma \tau \epsilon \omega s$ ( 1 Thess. i.3) of the Philippians gencrally (Reuss, Thiéol. Cliret. Vol. Ir. p. 172), but rather oljectively to the particular кoเvovía eis cùary previously specified: God had vouchsafed unto them, among other blessings, that of an open hand and heart ( $\tau a \dot{\tau} \tau \eta \nu \nu \dot{v} \mu i \hat{\nu}$ ठ $\omega \rho \eta \sigma \alpha{ }^{\mu} \mu \epsilon-$
 He will continue. This declaration, however, is expressed in a general form ; comp. Rom, ii. 7.
$\left.{ }^{\prime} \pi \iota \tau \in \lambda \in \sigma \in t\right]$ ' will accomplish,' 'will perfect,' not merely 'will perform it,' Author., but 'will bring it to a complete and perfect end,' Syr. SCA.] [explebit] ; sec notes on Gal. iii. 3. With regard to the dogmatical application of the words, which, owing to their probable
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specific reference cannot safely be pressed, it seems enough to say with Theoph.,
 $\tau \omega \nu \sigma \tau 0 \chi \dot{\alpha} \zeta_{\epsilon \tau \alpha l}$ : the inference is justly drawn, that God who has thus far blessed them with His grace will also bless them with the gift of perseverance ; compare 1 Cor. i. 8: 'Gottes Art ist es ja nicht, etwas halb zu thun,' Neander. The charge of semi-Pelagianism brought against Chrysostom in loc. has been satisfactorily disproved by Justiniani, who thus perspicuously sums up that great commentator's doctrinal statements ; 'vult Chrysostomus Deum et incipere et perficere: illud excitantis, hoc adjuvantis est gratie ; illa liberi arbitrii conatum prævertit, hæc comitatur.' On the doctrine of Perseverance generally, see the clear statements of Ebrard, Christliche Dogmatik, § 513, 514, Vol. 11. p. 534549. The conclusions arrived at are thus stated: ' Perseverantia est effectus sanctificationis. Sanctificatio est conditio perseverantiæ. Datur apostasia regenitorum, nempe si in sanctificatione inertes sunt,' p. 548 ; compare also some admirable comments of Jackson, Creed, x. 37.4 sq.

$\mathrm{X} \rho$. 'I $\eta \sigma$. .] 'unto, or $u p$ to the day of Christ Jesus, i.e. $\not \subset \chi \rho \iota ~ \tau \hat{\eta} s ~ \pi a p o u \sigma i a s ~ \tau o v ̂ ~$ Kupiov, Theoph. That St. Paul in these words assumes the nearness of the coming of the Lord (Alf.) cannot be positively asserted. It is certainly evasive to refer this to future generations (roîs $\dot{\epsilon} \xi \dot{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$, Theophyl.), but it may be fairly said that St. Paul is here using language which has not so much a mere historical, as a general and practical reference: the day of Christ, whether far off or near, is the decisive day to each individual ; it is practically coincident with the day of his death, and becomes, when addressed to the individual, an exaltation and amplification of that term. Death, indeed,
as has been well remarked by Bishop Reynolds, is dwelt upon but little in the N. T.; it is to the resurrection and to the day of Christ that the eyes of the believer are directed; 'semper ad beatam resurrectionem, tanquam ad scopum, referendi sunt oculi,' Calv. To maintain, then, that this is not the sense in which the apostle wrote the words (Alf.) seems here unduly and indemonstrably exclusive. See notes on 1 Tim. vi. 14, and compare (with caution) Usteri, Lehrb. II. 2. 4. B, p. 326 sq . On áx $\chi$ t and $\mu$ é $\chi \rho t$, see notes on 2 Timi. ii. 9.
7. $\kappa \alpha$ 守 $\omega$ s к. т. $\lambda.]^{\text {] }}$ 'even as:' explanatory statement of the reason why such a confidence is justly felt; compare 1 Cor. i. 6, Eph. i. 6. On the nature of this particle, see notes on Gal. iii. 16, and on Eph. l. c.
$\delta\{\kappa \alpha \iota \circ \nu$ ] 'ri,ht,' 'mect,' scil. 'secundum legem caritatis,' Van Hengel ; it is in accortlance with the genuine nature of my love (1 Cor. xiii. 7) to entertain such a confident hope : compare Acts iv. 19, Eph. vi. 1, 2 Pet. i. 13. Alford (with Meyer and De W.) remarks that the tivo classical constructions are סícatov द̣̇ $\mu$ è тoûro $\phi \rho$. (Herod. I. 39), and סíkalós cíul тои̃то $\phi \rho$. (Plato, Legg. x. 897). The last construction is the most idiomatic (comp. Krüger, Sprachl. § 55.3 .10 ), and perhaps the most usual in the best Greek, but there is nothing unclassical in the present usage; comp. Plato, Republ. I. p. 334, ठiкaloע $\tau \delta \tau \epsilon$ тоútols toùs тоעпроùs
 'to think this,' Auth., Syr.; 'hoc sentire,' Vulg.; i. e. to entertain this confidence: ' $\phi p o v e i ̀ \nu ~ h i c ~ n o n ~ d i c i t u r ~ d e ~ a n i m i ̀ ~$ affectu sed de mentis judicio,' Beza; compare 1 Cor. iv. 6 (Rec.), Gal. v. 10. To refer roûro to the prayer in verse 4 , 'hoc curare pro vobis,' Wolf (compare Conyb.), or to the expectation in ver. 6 , 'hoc omnibus vobis appetere, scil, omni
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curâ et precibus＇（Van Heng．），is unsat－ isfactory，and is certainly not required by úmép，which occurs several times in the N．T．（2 Cor．i．6， 8 ； 2 Thess．ii．1， al．），in a sense but little different from $\pi \in \rho^{\prime}$ ；seo Winer，Gram．§ 47．1，p． 343. The probable distinction，－＇$\pi \epsilon \rho$＇solam mentis circumspectionem，virte $\rho$ simul an－ imi propensionem significat＇（Weber， Demosth．p．130），is perfectly recogniza－ ble in the present case，but cannot be ex－ pressed without a periphrasis，e．$g$ ．＇to entertain this favorable opinion about you，＇＇ut ita de vobis sentiam et confi－ dam，＇Est．On the uses of $\dot{\operatorname{j} \pi} \mathrm{t} \rho$ and тtepí，see notes on Gal．i．4，and on фfo－ veîv，see Beck，Seelenl．rir．19，p． 61 sq． $\delta \iota \alpha ̀ \tau \delta$ €̌ $\chi \in \iota \nu$ к．$\tau . \lambda$ ．］＇because 1 have

［in corde meo positi］Syr．；not＇because you have me，＇Rosenm．，Conyb．：the apostle is throughout clearly the subject and agent（comp．ver．8）；the depth of his love warrants the fulness of his confi－ dence．In all cases the context，not the mere position of the accusatives，will be the surest guide ；compare Jolin i．49： see also Winer，Gr．§44．6，p．294．The translation of Beza，＇in animo tenere＇$=$ ＇quasi ．insculptum habere memorix＇
 see especially Justin．in loc．），is opposed both to the similar affectionate expres－ sions， 2 Cor．iii． 2 ，vii． 3 ，and to the pre－ vailing use of кapoía（comp．Beck，Bibl． Seelenl．III．24，p． 89 sq．，notes on ch．iv． 7，and on 1 Tim．i．5）in the N．T．It is the fervent love of the apostle that is ex－ pressed；and in this remembrance is ne－ cessarily involved；compare Chrysost． in loc．光 $\nu \tau \in \tau \circ \hat{\imath} S \delta \in \sigma$－ $\mu \circ$ is к．т．$\lambda$ ．］It is doubtful whether these words are to be connected with the preceding Sıà $\tau \delta$ E้ $\chi \in \iota \nu$ к．$\tau$ ．$\lambda$ ．（Chrys．， Theoph．），or with the succeeding $\sigma v \gamma \kappa \circ$－

עwעoús pou к．т．$\lambda$ ．（Calvin，Lachmann， Tisch．）．Neander and the majority of modern commentators adopt the former； the latter，however，seems more simple and natural．The apostle had his confi－ dence because he cherishes them in his heart；and he cherishes them because their liberality showed that whether in his sufferings（ $\delta \in \sigma \mu 0 \hat{s}$ ），which they alle－ viated，or in his exertions for the gospel （ $\tau \hat{\imath}$ àmo入．каi $\beta \in \beta$ ．），with which they sym－ pathized，they all were bound up with him in the strictest spiritual fellowship．On $\boldsymbol{\tau} \epsilon$－kal，which here serves to unite two otherwise separate and distinct notions， slightly enhancing the latter，see Har－ tung，Partil．Vol．II．p．98，and comp． notes on 1 Tin．iv． 10.
 fence（of）and confirmation of the gospel．＇ These words have been somewhat per－ versely interpreted．＇Amo入aría and $\beta \epsilon$－ Baíwos are certainly not synonymous （Rheinw．），－nor do they form an hen－ diadys，sc．àmo入．єis $\beta \in \beta$ ．（Heinr．；com－ pare Syr．＇defensione quæ est pro veri－ tate［confirmatione］cvangelii＇），－nor can $\tau \hat{\eta}$ à $\pi 0 \lambda$ ．be dissociated from $\tau 0 \hat{u}$ eviar．（Clrys．），both being under the vinculum of a common article（Green， Gr．p．211），－nor，finally，does it seem necessary to restrict the clause to the ju－ dicial process which resulted in the apos－ tle＇s imprisonment（Van Heng．）．It seems more natural to give both words their widest reference；to understand by ảmoдoría St．Paul＇s defence of the gos－ pel，whether before his heathen judges （compare 2 Tim．iv．16）or his Jewish opponents（comp．Phil．i．16，17），and by $\beta \in \beta a t \omega \sigma \in \iota$ his confirmation and estab－ lishment of its truth（Heb．vi．16），－not by his sufferings（Chrys．，Theod．），but by his teaching and preaching among his own followers and those who resorted to him（compare Acts xxviii．23，30）：seo


8. $\mu$ ov é $\sigma \tau^{\prime} \nu \nu$ So Rec. with ADEKL; great majority of mss. ; very many Vv. (but Vr. in such cases can scarcely be depended on for either side) and many Ff. (Griesb. [hut om.], Scholz.). The द̈नtiv is omitted by Tischend. and bracketed by Lachm. with BFG; 17.67**; Yulg., Claroman.; Chrysost. (ms.), Theoch.-ALops. ( Meycr, $1 / f f$.). The external evidence seems too decidedly in fitvor of the insertion to be overbalaneed by the somewhat doubtful internal argument that $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau i \nu$ is a reminiscence of Rom. i. 9 (Mey., Alf.). It does not seem much more probable that the transeriber should have borne in mind a remote reference, than that the apostlo should have twice used the same formula.
the good note of Wieseler, Chronol. p. 429, 430.
$\sigma v \gamma \kappa \circ \iota \nu \omega \nu$ ov's к. т. $\lambda$.] 'seeing that both in my defence of and, etc., ye are all partakers with me of my grace;' 'ut qui omnes mecum consortes estis gratiæ,' Schmid ; compare Hamm., and Scholef. Hints, p. 104. . The preceding ípâs, further characterized as é $\nu \tau \epsilon-\sigma v \gamma \kappa o เ \nu$., is rhetorically repeated (see Bernhardy, Synt. vi. 4, p. 275 sq.) to support $\pi \alpha^{\prime} \nu$ tas ; the whole clause serving to explain
 is doubtful whether $\mu o v$ is to be connected (a) with $\sigma u \gamma \kappa o t \nu \omega \nu o u s$ as a sccond genitive (Syr., Copt.), or (b) with $\tau \hat{\eta} s \chi^{\text {ápt- }}$ тos (compare Clarom., Vulg.), the proyoun being placed out of its order (Winer, $G r . \$ 22.7 .1$ ) to mark the reference of the prep. in ouyкoเv. As бuүкон. is found in the N. T. both with persons (1 Cor.ix. 23) and things (Rom. xi. 17), the context alone must decide ; this, in consequence of the meaning assigned below to $\chi$ d́pıs, scems in favor of $(a)$; compare ch. ii. 30 : so Hammond, De Wette. $\tau \hat{\eta} s \chi \dot{\alpha} \rho \iota \tau o s$ ] The reference of this subst. has been differently explained: the Greek commentators refer it more specifically 'to the grace of suffering;' comp. ver. 29 ; Rosenm., al. to the ' munus apostolicum,' scil. ' ye ate all assistants to me in my duty,' Storr, Peile; others again to the 'evangelii donatio,'
compare Van Heng. ; others to grace in its widest acceptation, Eph. ii. 8, Col. i. 6 (De TV. Alf.). Of these the first is too restrictive, the others, especially the last, too vague. The articlo secms to mark the $\chi$ ápıs as that vouchsafed in both the eases previously contemplated, sufforings for (ver. 29), and exertions in behalf of the gospel. The translation 'gaudii,' Clarom., Vulg., Ambrst., al., is apparently due to the reading xapâs, though no mss. have been adduced in which that variation is found.
8. $\mu \alpha ́ \rho \tau v$ s $\gamma \alpha \rho$ к. т. $\lambda$.] 'For God is my witness;' earnest confirmation of the foregoing verse, more especially of
 well says, oủ $\dot{\omega}$ s àmtбтоú $\mu \in \nu$ оs $\mu$ ápтvpa
 The reading $\mu 0 \iota$ [DEFG; al. ; Chrys.; Lat. Ff.] would scarcely involve any change of sense ; it would perhaps only a little more enhance tho personal relation. $\dot{\omega} s \epsilon \pi \iota \pi o$ 分 $\hat{\omega}]$ 'how I long after yout ; comp. ch. ii. 26, Rom. i. 11, 1 Thess. iii. 6, 2 Tinı. i. 4. The force of $\bar{\epsilon} \pi l$ in this compound does not mark intension ('vehementer desidero,' Van Heng.; 'expetam,' Beza), but, as in èmıงิuผeiv and similar words, the direction of the $\pi \delta$ 'tos; see notes on 2 Tim. ii. 4, and Fritz. Rom. i. 9, Vol. 1. p. 31. Again, it scems quite unnecessary with Van Heng. to restrict the $\pi \delta \delta^{2}$ os to 'ves-


træ consuetudinis desiderium ;' the longing and yearning of the apostle was for something more than mere earthly reunion ; it was for their eternal welfare and blessedness, and the realization, in its highest form, of the $\chi$ apls of which they were now ruykouvavoí. The context seems clearly to decide that ís here, and probably also Rom. i. 9 , is not 'quod' (Rosenmuller, De Wette) but 'quomodo' (Syr., Copt.), scil. 'quantopere,' 'quam propense,' Corn. a Lap.; com-
 द่กเтังิิ.
t'v $\sigma \pi \lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha} \gamma \nu 015 \mathrm{X}$. 'I.] This forcille expression must not be understood merely as qualitative, - 'opponit Christi viscera carnali affectui,' Calv., but as semilocal, ' in the bowels of Christ,' in the bowels of Him with whom the apostle's very being was so united (Gal. ii. 20), that Christ's heart had, as it were, become his, and beat in his bosom: comp. Meyer in loc., who has well maintained this more deep and spiritual interpretation. 'Ev thus retains its natural and usual force (contr. Rilliet), and the gen. is not the gen. auctoris or originis (Hartung, Casus, p. 17), as apparently Chrys.

 We can hardly term this use of $\sigma \pi \lambda d \gamma-$
 a similar use is sufficiently common in classical Greek (see examples in Rost u. Palm, Lex. s. v., Vol. II. p. 1501); the verb $\sigma \pi \lambda a \gamma \chi v i$ Souat, however, and the
 $\chi^{\text {yos }}$ (when not in its medical sense, Hippocr. p. 89) seem purely so, white, on the contrary, the substantive $\epsilon \dot{v} \sigma \pi \lambda a \gamma x-$ vía occurs in Eurip. Rhes. 192. For a list of Hebraisms of the New Test. judiciously classified, see Winer, Gram. § 3, p. 27 sq.
9. кai тоvิт० $\pi \rho \circ \sigma$.] 'Et hoc precor,' hut not 'propterea precor,' as Wolf, 2 : the kal with its simple copulative forco introduces the apostle's prayer (ver: 9 11) alluded to in ver. 4 , while the тoùro prepares the reader for the statement of its contents, ' and this which follows is what I pray.' The kai (as Meyer observes) thus coalesces more with roûro than $\pi \rho \rho \sigma$ єúхонаи ; not каl троб. тоѝто, but каì тои̃тo «роб. To comnect the clause closely with what precedes (Rillict) destroys all the force of ver. 8.
7va] The particle has here what has been ealled its secondary telic force (see notes on Ephl. i. 17) ; i.e. it does not directly indicate the purpose of the prayer, but blends with it also its subject and purport : Theodorus in loc. paraphrases it by a simple infin. It may be again remarked that this sccondary and blended use (esp. after verbs of prayer), though not recognized by Mejer and Fritzsche, cannot be safely denied in the N. T. : there are numerous passages (setting aside the disputed use after a prophecy) in which the full telic force ('in order that') cannot he sustained in translation without artificc or circumlocution; e. g. comp. Mejer on John xv. 8. We may observe further, that this use of iva, is not confined to the N. T. : it was certainly common in Hellenic Greek (see examples in Winer, Gr. \$44. 8, p. 300), and in modern Greek, under the form $\nu \grave{a}$ with the sulbj., it lapses (after a large class of verbs) into a mere periphrasis of the infinitive ; see Corpe, Gramm. pp. 129, 130.
$\hat{\eta} \dot{\alpha} \gamma \dot{\alpha} \pi \eta \quad \hat{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu]$ 'yourr love,' not, towards the apostle (Chrys.), -which had been so abundantly shown as to leave a prayer for its increase almost unnecessary; nor again, 'toward God' (Just.), nor even, 'towards one another,' Meyer, Alf. (Theodorus unites the two . comp.

## 

Wiesing.), both of which seem unnecessarily restrictive. It scems rather 'towards all' (comp. De Wette), -a love which, already shown in, and forming an element of, their kotvovia, ver. 4 (not identical with it, Alf.), the apostle prays may still more and more increase, not so much per se, as in the special elements of knowledge and moral perception. Examples of the very intelligible $\mu \hat{\alpha} \lambda \lambda$ до каl $\mu \hat{\lambda \lambda \lambda o v ~ w i l l ~ b e ~ f o u n d ~ i n ~ K y p k e, ~ O b s . ~ V o l . ~}$ ir. p. 307.
$\pi \in f I \sigma \sigma \in \dot{u} \eta$
द̀v к. т. $\lambda$.] 'may abound in knouldedye and all (every form of) perception,' not 'in all knowletge and perception,' Luther, - an atrraction for which there seems no authority. The exact force of ${ }_{\epsilon} \mathrm{e} \nu$ is somewhat doultful ; it can scurcely (a) approximate in meaning to $\mu \in \tau$ d́, Chrys. (who, however, fluctuates between this preposition and $\epsilon \xi)$, Corn. a Lap., al.; for this use, though grammatically defensible (comp. examples in Green, Gr. p. 289), is not exegetically satisfactory, as ver. 10 shows that it is not to
 to $\mathrm{e}^{\pi} \pi \gamma^{\prime}$. and aiov. more éspecially, as insphering and defining that love, that attention is directed ; nor (b) does it exactly denote the manner of the increase (De W.), as this again seems to give too little prominence to èmivv, and aiow.; nor, lastly, is $\frac{\epsilon}{\ell}$ here instrumental, Flatt, Heinr., - as love could hardly be said to increase by the agency of knowledge. The prep. is thus not simply equivalent to $\mu \epsilon \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha}$, katá, or $\delta$ odá (much less to eis, comp. Winer, Gr. §50. 5, p. 370), but with its usual force marks the sphere, elements, or particulars, in which the increase was to take place; compare Wincr, Gr. §48, a, p. 345. It was not for au increase of their love absolutely that the apostle prayed, for love might become the sport of every impulse (comp. Wiesing.), but it was for its increase in the
important particulars, a sound knowl. edge of the truth and a right spiritual perception, and of both of which it was to have still more and moro. Пepır $\sigma \in \dot{u}^{-}$ civ is thus not absolute, but closely in union with ${ }^{e} \nu$ and its dative, and may be considered generally and practically as identical with abundare and an ablative, the substantives defining the elements and items in which the increase is realized ; compare 2 Cor. viii. 7, Col. ii. 7, al. Laclmann, Tischendorf read $\pi \epsilon \rho / \sigma-$ $\sigma \in \dot{e} \sigma \eta$ with BDE; al., bat as two of these mss., DE, adopt the aor. in ver. 26 without critical support, their reading is here sulspicious. $\quad \frac{\mathfrak{E}}{} \pi \imath \gamma \nu$ к каl $\pi \dot{\alpha} \sigma \eta \quad \alpha i \sigma$ ง.] These two sulstantives
 'accurata cognitio' (see notes on Eph. i. 17), denotes a sound knowledge of theoretical and practical truth (Mey.), $\tau \grave{\nu}$

 sus' (Vulg., Clarom.) is more generic, but here, as the context implies, must be limited to right spiritual discernment
 tus] Syr.); a sensitively correct moral perception (עónots, Hesych.) of the true nature, good or bad, of each circumstance, case, or object which experience may present; compare Prov. i. 4, where it is in comnection with êvoora, and Exod. xxviii. 3, where it is joined with $\sigma o$ ía. $^{2}$. It only occurs here in the N. T. ; the in-
 of feeling,' etc.) is found Heb. v. 14; compare Jer. iv. 19. The adjective $\pi \dot{\alpha} \sigma$ y is not intensive ('plena et solida,' Calv.), but, as apparently always in St. Paul's Fepp., extensive, ' every form of;' comp. notes on Eph. i. 8.
10. $\epsilon$ is $\tau \delta \delta$ бок $\iota \mu \dot{\alpha} \zeta \epsilon \iota \nu$ к.т..入.] 'for you to prove things that are excellent;' purpose of the $\pi \epsilon \rho / \sigma \sigma$. ${ }^{2} \nu$ हो $\pi \imath \gamma$. kal aiav.
（not result，－a meaning grammatically admissible，but here inapplicable；com－ pare Winer，Gri．44．5，p．29t，note），to which the further and final purpose＂ va $\hat{\eta} \tau \in \kappa \cdot \tau . \lambda$ ．is appended in the next clause． The words $\delta o k . \tau \grave{\alpha} \delta i a \phi$. ，both here and Rom．ii．18，may correctly receive two，if not three，different interpretations，vary－ ing with the meanings given to $\delta$ laфé－ poyta，and the shade of meaning assigned to $\delta о \kappa \iota \mu \dot{\alpha} \zeta \epsilon \iota$ ．Thus they may imply either（a）＇to prove（distinguish between） things that are different，＇$i$ ．e．to discrimi－
 Epict．1．20），－whether simply between what is right and wrong（Theoph on Rom．ii．18，De W．．），or between differ－ ent degrees of good and their contraries

 $\lambda \eta \lambda \alpha$ є̈ $\chi$ оעta，＇Theod．）；so Beza，Van Heng．，Alf．，al．；（b）＇to approve of things that are excellent，＇＇ut probetis potiora，＇ Vulg．，тà $\delta \iota \alpha \phi$ épovтa being used in the same sense as in Matth．x．31，xii．12， Luke xii．7， 24 （Meyer adds Xen．Hier． I．3，$\tau \grave{\alpha}$ סıa申．，Dio Cass xliv．25），and бокццд́ $\varsigma \epsilon \iota \nu$ in its derivative sense，comp． Rom．xiv．22， 1 Cor．xvi．3，and exam－ ples in Rost u．Palm，Lex．s．v．；so Au－ thor．，Mey．，al．；or lastly（ $b_{1}$ ）＇to prove， Uring to the test，things that are excellent，＇ Syr．［ut discernatis convenientia］，Nith． ［ut perpendatis quæ prostat］，the pri－ mary meaning of סork being a little more exactly preserved ；sce Rom．xii．2，Eph． v．10．Exegetical considerations must alone decide ；these scem slightly in fil－ vor of the meaning of $\delta \iota \alpha ф$ époита（＇pre－ stabilia，sc．in bonis optima，＇Beng．） adopted in（ $b$ ）and（ $b_{1}$ ），－the prayer for the increase of love being more naturally realized in proving or approving what is excellent，what is really worthy of love， than in merely discriminating between what is different．Between（b）and $\left(b_{1}\right)$
the preceding aios $\dot{\eta} \sigma \in t$ and the prevailing lexical meaning of סoк．decides us in fa－ vor of the lutter ；so Theophyl．（ $\tau \delta \sigma \dot{\nu} \mu$－
 $\chi \rho \hat{\eta}$ фi入єiv кal тivas $\mu \grave{\eta})$ ，and apparently Chrysostom，Beng．（＇explorare et am－ plecti＇），al．，who appear correctly to hold to the more exact meaning of ठокء $\mu$ ás $\zeta \iota \nu$ ： comp．notes on Eph．v． 10.
єỉtкрıข $\in \hat{i}$ ］＇pure，＇ 2 Pet．iii． 1 ； compare 1 Cor．v． 8,2 Cor．i． 12 ，ii． 17. The derivation of this adjective，though a word not uncommon cither in earlier or later Greek，is somewhat doubtful． The most probable is that adopted by Stallbaum（Plato，Plued． 77 A），who de－ rives it from $\epsilon i \bar{\lambda}{ }^{2}$［he must mean $\left.\epsilon^{\prime \prime} \lambda \eta\right\rangle$ ． and крive，with reference to a root cì $\epsilon i ̂ v$ ． As，however，the primary meaning of this root is not quite certain，eỉגıк．may be either＇what is pareclled off by itself＇？ （gregatim），with reference to $\epsilon^{\top} \lambda \eta$（see especially Buttmann，Lexil．§ 44，and compare Rost u．I＇alm，Lex．s．v．），or more probably，＇volubili agitatione se－ cretum，＇with reference to the meaning volvere，which has recently been indicated as the primary meaning of eìeiv ；sec esp． Phiiol．Museum，Vol．I．p． 405 sq．So
 ג̀ $\mu$ r＇ध̀s é éépou；see Plutarch，Qucest．Rom．
 § 54，kavapods où ${ }^{3}$ ei入ukpivís，and esp． §61，where $\tau \alpha ̀ ~ \epsilon i \lambda \lambda u c p \nu \eta$ and $\tau \alpha ̀ ~ \mu u \kappa \tau \alpha ̀ ~ a r e ~$ opposed to each otlier ；compare also Max．Tyr．Diss．31．The more usual， but less prob．，derivation is from $\epsilon^{〔} \lambda \eta$ ， ＇splendor＇［＇EA－，cognate with $\mathrm{ZE} \mathrm{\Lambda}$ ，＇ Benfey，Wurzellex．Vol．1．p．460］，in which case the rough breathing would be more suitable ；compare Schneider on Plato，Rep．11．p．123．Scveral exam－ ples of the use of cixckp．will be found in Loesner，Obs．p．350，Kypke，Obs．Vol． II．p．398，and Elsner，Ols．Vol．Ir．p． 10 ，of which the most pertinent are


those above.

'without offence, stumbling; " inoficnso cursu,' Beza; intransitively as in Acts
 pare Suicer, Thesaur. s.v. Vol. 1. p. 495. Chrys, and others give an active meaning, as in I Cor' x. 32, 'giving no offence,' ei入urр. marking their relation to God, à «ро́бк. their relation to men. This hardly accords with the context, in which their inward state and relations to God form the sole subject of the prayer. It will be best, then, in spite of $!$ Cor. l. c., to maintain the intransitive meaning; so apparently Vulg., Syriac, Coptic; but these are cases in which the Vv . scarcely give a definite opinion.
$\epsilon$ is $\dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon \in \rho \alpha \nu X \rho$.] 'aguinst the day of Clrist;' 'in diem,' Vulg., scil. 'iva $\tau \dot{\sigma} \tau \epsilon$ єن́peస̂ day,' etc., Auth. Ver. (comparo Beza), which would rather have been expressed by äxpis ńpépas, as in ver 6. The preposition has here not its temporal, but its ethical force; compare ch. ii. 16, Ephes. iv. 30, and notes on 2 Tim. i. 12. On the expressin $\frac{n}{\eta} \mu \epsilon \epsilon^{\rho} \rho \alpha \mathrm{X} \rho$. see the notes on ver. 6.
11. $\pi \in \pi \lambda \eta \rho \omega \mu \epsilon \in \nu$ о $\kappa$ к. T. $\lambda$. .] 'being filled with the fruit of rightcousness ;' modal clause defining more fully єỉıкр. каl $\dot{\alpha} \pi \rho \delta \sigma^{\prime}$., and specifying not only on the negative, but also on the positive side the fullest and completest Christian development. The accus. кар $\pi \delta \nu[\kappa \alpha \rho \pi \omega ิ \nu$, Rec., is unsupported by uncial authority] is that of 'the remoter object,' marking that in which the action of the verb has its realization; so Col. i. 9, $\pi \lambda \eta \rho \omega \stackrel{\eta}{\mathrm{\eta}} \tau \epsilon$
 Hartung, Casus, p. 62 sq. and notes on 1 Tim. vi. 5, where this construction is discussed. If we compare Rom. xv. 14,
 recognize the primary distinction be-
tween the cases: the gen., the 'whencecase,' marks the absolute material out of which the fulness was realized (compare Krüger, Sprachl. §47. 16) ; the accus., the 'whither-case,' the object towards which and along which the action tended, and, as it were, in the domain of which the fulness was evinced; see Schenerl., Synt. § 9.1, p. 63. The gen. סıкatoov́rns is the gen. originis, that from which the картঠs emanates (Hartung, Cusus, p. 63), or perhaps more strictly, that of the oriqinating cause (Scheucrl. Synt. § 17. 1, p. 125),- a картঠ̀s that is the production of סııcuoov́yŋ ; compare Gal. v. 22, Eph. v. 9, James iii. 18, and on the meaning of картís, notes on Gal. l. c.
With regard to the strict meaning of $\delta t-$ кatoбúvn it may be briefly remarked that wo must in all cases be guided by the context : here ver. 10 and the app. emphasis on rap\#d̀ point to $\delta \iota \kappa$, as a moral habitus (comp. Chrys.), as in Rom. vi. 13, Eph. v. 9, al., - not 'justification' proper (Rilliet), but the righteousness which results from it and is evinced in good works ; so Calv., Meyer, De W. On the distinction between the 'righteousness of sanctification' and the 'righteousness of justification,' see especially the admirable sermon of Hooker, $\$ 6$, Vol. III. p. 611 (ed. Feble), and on the doctrine of justification generally, the short but comprehensive treatise of Waterland, Worles, Vol. vi. pp. 1-38.
$\tau \delta \nu \delta \iota \alpha{ }^{\prime} \mathrm{I}$. X. serves to specify the $\kappa \alpha \rho \pi \delta \nu$, as being only and solely through Christ; compare notes on 2 Tim. i. 13. This frut is a communication of the life of Christ to His own (Wiesing.) ; it results fiom ' the pure grace of Christ our Lord whereby we were in Him [by the working of the Spirit He sent, Gal. ii. 20, iii. 22, Mey.] made to do those good works that God had appointed for us to

Kinow that my sufferings have furthered the gospel， for Christ is preached by all．I indeed would fuin depart to Christ，but for your sake I shall remain．



walk in，＇King Edw．VI．Catech．，cited by Waterland，Justif．Vol．vi．p． 31. $\epsilon$ is $\delta 6 \xi \alpha \nu \kappa \alpha i \% \pi$ ．Өєo ̂̀］＇to the praise and glory of God：＇the praise and glory of God is the＇finis primarius＇of the $\pi \epsilon \pi \lambda \eta \rho \bar{\omega} \sigma \hat{*}$ at．Hence＇$u d$ gloriam，＇ Beza，is more exact than＇in gloriam，＇ Vulg．，Clarom．；see notes on Eph．i． 6. $\Delta \delta \xi a$ is here，as Meyer pertinently re－ marks，the＇majesty＇of God per se， E゙Tawos，the＇praise and glorification＇of the same ；compare Eph．i．6，12，14， 1 Pet．i． 7 ．

12．$\gamma เ \nu \dot{\sigma} \sigma k \in \iota \nu \delta$ è к．$\tau . \lambda$.$] ＇Now$ I would have you lnow；＇the transitional $\delta \notin$（Hartung，Partik．$\delta \epsilon ́, 2,3$, Vol．I．p． 165）introduces the fresh subject of the apostle＇s present condition at Rome，his hopes and fears ；compare Rom．i．13， 1 Cor．xii．1， 1 Thess．iv．13，al．It seems rather fur－fetched in Meyer，followed by Alf．，to refer $\gamma \iota \nu \dot{\omega} \sigma \kappa$ ．to $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \pi \tau \gamma \nu$ ．above， ＇and as a part of this knowledge I would have you know，＇etc．There certainly scems no peculiar emphasis in $\gamma \iota \nu \omega \sigma \kappa \epsilon \iota$ ； the order is the uatural one（comp．Jude 5）when Boú $о \mu a \iota$ is unemphatic；con－ trast 1 Tim．ii．8，v．14，al．Though few minor points deserve more attention in the study of the N．T．than the collo－ cation of words，we must still be careful not to overpress collocations which arise not so much from design as from a natu－ ral and instinctive rhythm；compare 2 Cor．i． 8.
$\left.\tau \grave{\varkappa} \kappa \alpha \tau^{\prime}{ }^{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}} \mu \boldsymbol{\mu} \in\right]$
＇$m y$ circumstances，＇＇rerum inearum con－ ditio，＇Wolf；comp．Eph．vi．21，Col．iv． 7，Tobit x .8 ，and see illustrations in Elsner，Obs．Vol．II．p．234，Wetst．in Eph．l．c．In such cases кatà is local， and marks，as it were，an extension along an object；compare Acts xxvi．3， and see Winer，Gr．§49．d，p．356．In
late writers，katd with a personal pro－ noun becomes almost equivalent to a possessive pronoun，and with a substan－ tive almost equivalent to a simple gen．； comp． 2 Macc．xv． 37.
$\mu a \bar{a} \lambda 0 \nu]$＇rather；＇not＇maxime＇or ＇excellenter＇（compare Beza），but＇po－ titus，＇ruther than what might have been expected，－viz．hinderance ：sce Winer， Gr．§ $35.4, \mathrm{p} .217$ ，by whom this use of the comparative is well illustrated．
$\pi \rho о к о \pi \eta \nu$ ］＇alvance，＇＇furtherance；＇ a substantive of later Greck condemned by the Atticists，see notes on 1 Tim．iv． 15，arru compare Triller on Thom．M． s．v．p． 741 （cd．Bernh．），who，though perhaps justly pleading for the word as an intelligible and cven elegant form，is unable to cite any instance of its use in any carly writer，Attic or otherwise．Nu－ merous examples，especially out of Plu－ tarch，are cited by Wetst．in loc．
є่ $\lambda$ 向 $\lambda \cup \vartheta \in \nu$ ］＇have fallen out，＇Author． Ver．；compare Wisdom xv．5，eis ơvetōos e้p $\uparrow \in \tau \alpha$ ．Further but doubtful exam－ ples are cited by Raphel，Annot．Vol．Ir． p． 499 ；at any rate，from them take out Mark v．26，Acts xix． 27 （cited even by Mcyer），in which ė入এєєiv certainly implies nothing more than simple（cthical）mo－ tion．Alford adduces Herodot．I．120， ès à $\sigma N \uparrow \in \nu$ ̀̀s point．

13．$\ddot{\omega} \sigma \tau \in \tau o \grave{v} s \delta \in \sigma \mu . \kappa . \tau . \lambda_{\text {．］}}$ ］＇so that my bonds have become manifest in Christ ；＇illustrations of the above $\pi \rho o-$ коти́；first beneficial result of his im－ prisonment：＇duos nunc sigillatim apos－ tolus fortunæ suæ adversæ memorat ef－ fectus，＇Van Heng．The order of the words seems clearly to imply that $\epsilon \nu X \rho$ ． must bo joined，－not with $\delta \in \sigma \mu 0$ ús，Au－ thor．Ver．，al．，scil．＇ad provehendum

## 

Christi honorem，＇Calv．，but with фave－ poús，on which，perhaps，there is a slight emphasis；the $\delta \in \sigma \mu 0$ l were not криттоí， but фavepol；nor фavepol，only，but фave－ pol $̇$ èv Xp．，＇manifesta in Christo，＇Cla－ rom．，manifest－not＇through Clurist，＇ Theoph．，Ceum．，but＇in Christ，＇mani－ fest as horne in fellowship with Him，and in His service．On this important qual－ itative formula，which must never be vaguely explained awray，sce notes on Gal．ii．17，and for a bricf explanation of its sencral force，compare IIooker， Serm．iII．Vol．ini．p． 763 （ed．Vicble）． The variation $\phi a \nu, \gamma \in \nu \nu^{\prime} \sigma s$ ．（Chrys，adds qoùs）द̇v X $\rho$ ．with DEFG；Bosrn．，Vulg．， al．，shows perhaps that some difinculty has been felt in the connection．
$\dot{\epsilon} \nu \delta ̋ \lambda \omega \tau \hat{\omega} \pi \rho \alpha, \iota \tau$ ．］＇in the whole practo－ rium．＇The meaning of mpatt $\mathrm{p}_{\mathrm{p}}$ ov in this passage lias been abundantly dis－ cussed．Tuken per se，the adjectival sub－ stantive．＇prectorium＇has apparently the following meanings：（a）＇the gencral＇s tent，＇sc．＇tentorium or trbernaculum， （Livy，vir．12），and derivatively＇the council of waw＇held there（Livy xxyr． 15）；（6）the＂palace of a provincial gov－ crnor＇（Ciccro，Verr．xir． 28 ；compare Matth．xxvii． 27 ，Mark xv．16；al．），sc． ＇domicilium，＇and thence derivatively，（a） ＇the palace of a king＇（Juv．x．161； compare Acts xxiii．35），and even（ $\beta$ ） ＇the mansion of a private individual＇ （compare Suct．Octiv．72）；lastly，（c） ＇the borly－guard of the emperor＇（＇Tacit． List．IV．46）；and thence not improba－ bly，（d）＇the guard－house or barracks where they were stationed；＇compare Scheller，Lex．sdv．，from which this ab－ stract has boen compiled．In tho pres－ ent passage Chrys．and the patristic ex－ positors all adopt（ $b, a$ ）and refer the term to＇the emperor＇s palace＇（ $\tau \grave{\alpha}$ ßaб\}$\lambda \in t a$ ），but since the time of Perizonius （de Pract．et Pratorio，Francq．1687）
nearly all modern commentators adopt （d），and refer $\pi \rho a / \tau$ ．to the＇castrum Præ－ torianorum＇built and fortified by Seja－ nus，not far from the＇Porta Viminalis；＇ compare Suct．Tiber．37，Tacit．Ann．Iv． 2，Dio Cass．lyir．19．The patristic in－ terpretation，on account of the lax use of ＇prætorium，＇seems fairly defeusible： as，however there is no proof that the inperial palace at Rome was ever so called，and as it is expressly said，Acts xxviii．16，that St．Paul was delivered $\tau ⿳ 亠 丷 厂 犬$ ．$\sigma \tau \rho \alpha \tau о \pi \epsilon \delta \dot{\alpha} \rho \chi \omega$（one of the two Præ－ fecti Pretorio，perhaps Burrus），and by him assimned to the custorly of a（Pre－ torian）soldier，it seems more probable that the apostle is here referring to the ＇castrum Prectorianorum，＇－not merely to the smaller portion of it attached to the palace of Nero（Wieseler，Chronol．p． 403，followed by Hows．［Vol．ir．p．510， cd．2］，and Alf．in loc．），but as ö $\lambda \omega$ and the subsequent generic тoîs $\lambda$ oımois $\pi \hat{a} \sigma \iota \nu$ scem to imply，－to the whole camp of the Prætorians，whether inside or outside the city，－in which general designation it is not improbable that the oikía Kaí $\alpha$－ pos（chap．iv．22）may be included：sec notes in loc．The interpr．＇hall of judi－ cature，＇IIamm．，al．（sce Wolf in loc．）， docs not appear cither satisfactory or tenable．The arguments based on this passage by Baur（der Apost． Parl．p． 469 sq．）agrinst the genuinc－ ness of this Ep．must be pronounced rery hopeless and unconvincing．
kal tois $\lambda 0 \iota \pi 0 \hat{\imath}$ ］＇and to all the rest，＇beside the Practorian camp，＇reli－ quis omnibus Romæ versantibus，＇comp． Neander，Planting，Vol．1．p． 317 （Bohn）： not＇the rest of the Pretorians＇（Wiesc－ lor，Chronol．p．457），a meaning too lim－ itel；nor，＇hominibus exteris（gentilibus） quibuscunque，＇Van Heng．，a meaning which oi तourol certainly does not neces－ sarily bear．Vulg．，Ath．，and Author．
 $\mu 0 i ̂ s ~ \mu o \nu ~ \pi \epsilon \epsilon \rho \iota \sigma \sigma o \tau \in ́ \rho \omega s ~ \tau o \lambda \mu a ̂ \nu ~ c ̉ ф o ́ ß \omega s ~ \tau o ̀ \nu ~ \lambda o ́ \gamma o \nu ~ \lambda a \lambda \epsilon i ̂ \nu . ~{ }^{15}$ Tivés
refer roîs 入otmoîs to locality, 'in other
 dative being under the vinculum of $\epsilon \nu$ : this is grammatically possible, but, as入oınds is not elsewhere applied to places in the N. T., not very probable; comp. 2 Cor. xiii. 2.
14. $\kappa a\}$ tov̀s $\pi \lambda \in\{o \nu a s\}$ 'and that the greater part of the brethren:' sccond beneficial effect of the apostle's imprisonment. The presence of the article obviously shows that $\pi \lambda$ elopas must here retain its proper comparative force, - not
'many,' Auth. Ver. ih ém [multitudo] Syr., but ' the greater portion,' ' the more part,' as Author. in Acts xix. 32, xxvii. 12, 1 Cor. ix. 19, xv. 6. So also 2 Cor. ii. 6, iv. 15, ix. 2, where bath Luther and Auth. incorrectly retain the positive: $\epsilon^{2} \nu \mathrm{~K} v \rho, \pi \in \pi 0$ เงั.] 'having in the Lord confidence in my bonds; ' not 'in regard of my bonds' (Flatt, Rill.), which vitiates the construction; the dative not being a dative ' of reference to ' (comp. Gal. i. 22), but the usual transmissive dative. At first sight it might seem more simple and natural with Syr, to connect $e^{e} \nu$ K $u p i \omega$ with ${ }^{2} \delta \in \lambda$ $\phi \omega \bar{\nu}$, 'brethren united with, in fellowship with the Lord, - a construction admissible in point of grammar (Winer, Gr. § 20. 2, p. 123), but open to the serious objection that thongh the important modal adjunct, $\epsilon^{\epsilon} \nu$ K $\nu \rho i(\varphi$, occurs several times in St. Paul's Epistles vith substantives or quasi-substantives, e. g. Rom. xvi. 8, 13, Epph. iv. 1, vi. 21, Col. iv. 7, it is never found with $\alpha \dot{\delta} \delta \lambda \phi \sigma^{\prime}$ : Eph. vi. 21, cited in opp. by Van Heng., is not in point; sce Meyer in loc. On the contrary, $\pi \in \pi 0$ in. is found similarly joined with $\mathrm{\epsilon}^{2} \mathrm{~V}$ Kup. chap. ii. 24, Galat. v. 10, 2 Thess. iii. 4, comp. Rom. xiv. 4. The objection that in these and similar cases
$\pi \in \pi 01$. stands first in the sentence (Alf.), is not here of any moment ; the emphasis rests on $\epsilon \nu$ Kupi $\varphi$, and properly causes its precedence : surely it must have been 'in the Lord,' and in Him only, that confidence could have been felt - when in bonds: so rightly Meyer, and very decidedly Winer, Gr. § 20. 2, p. 124.
$\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \sigma \sigma \circ \tau \epsilon \in \omega s$ тon $\mu \hat{\alpha} \nu$ ] 'are more abundantly bold,' scil. than when I was not in bonds; not ' are very much emboldened,' Conyb., a needless dilution of the comparative ; 'hâc freti plus solito audere debemus, jam in personâ fratrum pignus victorix nostre habentes,' Calv. The construction adopted by Grotius, Baumg., Crus., al., $\pi \in p t \sigma \sigma$. à $\phi \dot{\beta} \beta \omega s$, i.e. á $\phi 0 \beta \omega \tau$ t́p $\rho \omega$ s, is eminently unsatisfactory ; each verb naturally takes its own adverb.

 olas, a passage which may have suggested here the insertion of the nearly certain gloss $\tau 0 \hat{v} \Theta \epsilon o \hat{v}$, as in AB ; about 20 mss ; majority of Vv. (Lachm.). The variations (see Tisch.) serve to confirm the shorter reading.
15. $\tau \iota \nu$ ย̀s $\mu \dot{\text { ¢ } \nu} \boldsymbol{\nu}$ K. $\tau . \lambda_{\text {.] }}$ ] 'Some indeed even from envy and strife:' exceptions to the foregoing; 'this is the case with all; some preach from bad motives.' The previous definition, $̇ \nu \mathrm{~K} \nu \rho . \pi \in \pi 0 เ \uparrow$., seems to render it impossible that the Tivès $\mu$ èv should be comprised in the à $\delta \in \lambda \phi o l$, ver. 14. The mention of 'speaking the word' brings to the apostle's mind all who were doing so; he pauses then to allude to all, specifying under the $\tau \iota \nu \in{ }^{\prime} s{ }^{\hat{e}} \mathrm{e} \nu$ (obs. not oi $\mu \in \grave{\iota} \nu$ as in ver. 16) his Judaizing - not his unbelieving (Chrys.) - opponents, while in $\tau \iota \nu$ ès $\delta \grave{\epsilon}$ he reverts to the sounder majority mentioned in ver. 14. Kal, with its common contrasting force in such collocations (sce notes on chap. iv. 12 ; comp. Klotz,



Devar. Vol. ir. p. 636, and examples in Hartung, Partik. Vol. i. pp. 136, 137) marks that there were, alas! other motives beside the good ones that might be inferred from the preceding words. Alford refers ral to tives, 'besides those mentioned ver. 14.' This, however, does not seem tenable.
$\phi \uparrow \delta \nu \circ \nu]$ 'on account of envy,' or more iliomatically, 'from envy,' 'for envy;' - to gratify that evil feeling ; so Matth. xxvii. 18, Mark xv. 10, comp. Winer, Gr. § 49. c, p. 355, and notes on Gal. iv. 13. Alberti adduces somewhat pertinently Philemon [Major, a comic poct,
 סià фîbuon; sce Meineke, Com. Fragm. Vol. Iv. p. 55. It is scarcely necessary to add that the translation ' amid envy' (Jowett on Gal. iv. 10), is quite untenable : סià with an uccus. in local or quasilocal references is purely poetical; compare Bernhardy, Symt. v. 18, p. 236.
$\delta i^{\prime} \in \mathcal{U} \delta o k\{a \nu]$ 'onaccount of, from, good
 towards the apostle; not towards others in respect of their salvation (Est.). De W. objects to this meaning of eüסokía as not sufficiently confirmed, and adopts the transl. 'good pleasure,' sc. of me and my affairs. This seems somewhat hypercritical; surely the opposition סià $\phi$ Sobyou coupled with $\mathfrak{\xi \xi}$ àzán $\eta \mathrm{s}$, ver. 16, scems sufficient to warrant the current translation; see Fritz. Rom. Vol. 11. p. 372, whose note, however, is not in all points perfectly exact ; comp. notes on Eph. i. 5 , and the quaint but suggestive comments of Andrewes, Serm. xili. Vol. I. p. 230 (Angl.-Cath. Libr.). The kal refers to contrary motives just enunciated; and the party specified under $\tau t \nu \in{ }^{\prime} s$ $\delta \epsilon$, though practically coincident with the $\pi \lambda \epsilon$ loves, are yet, as De Wette rightly observes, put slightly under a different
point of view, and as forming the opposite party to those last mentioned. Thus of those who spake the word, $\tau t \nu \in{ }^{\prime} s \mu \in \mathcal{e} \nu$ were factious and envious, $\tau \omega \nu$ ès $\delta \frac{1}{\varepsilon}$ full of good will and kindly feeling, and these latter were they who constitute the $\pi \lambda \epsilon \epsilon^{-}$ ovas $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ à $\delta \in \lambda \phi \hat{\omega} \nu$, ver. 14.
 deed (that are) of love (do so) ;' sc. övres, comp. Rom. ii. 8, Gnl. iii. 7. The two classes mentioned in the last verse are now by oi $\mu$ è $\nu$ and oi $\delta$ t̀ a little more exactly specified, the order being inverted. In Rec. the more natural order is preserved, but is very insufficiently supported, viz., only by one of the second correctors of D, K ( L omits of $\mu \hat{\nu} \nu \bar{\epsilon}^{\epsilon} \xi$ Épis. to $\mu o u$ ), other mss. ; Syr:-Philox. and other Vv., and several Greek Ff. The Auth. Ver, and apparently nearly all the oller expositors make of $\mu$ èv the subject, and refer $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \xi \dot{\alpha} \alpha$ árinns $^{2}$ to the supplied clause, $\tau \delta \nu \mathrm{X} \rho$. к $\eta \rho$. : so also Matth., Alf., and other modern commentators. This is plausible at first sight, but on a netrer examination can hardly be maintained. For first, $\epsilon \xi$ à $\gamma$ ám $\eta s$ would thus be only a kind of repetition of $\delta$ ià єüठoкia,
 ondly, the force of the causal participial clause would be much impaired, for the object of the apostle is rather to specify the motives which caused this difference of behavior in the two classes than merely to reiterate the nature of it. See esp. De Wette in loc. by whom the present interpretation is ably maintained; so Meyer, Wies., and (in language perhaps too confident), Van Heng. : where appy. all the ancient versions are on the other side, it is not wise to be too positive. On
 amore originem ducunt,' sce notes on Gal. iii. 7, and Fritz. on Rom. ii. 8, Vol.. x. p. 105. $\in i \delta \delta \dot{\tau} \in s$ § $\tau \iota \kappa$. $\tau . \lambda$.

є̇̇aryє入iov кєîpal，

＇as they lenow that I am appointed for the defence of thegospel，＇i．e．＇set to defend the gospel，＇Tynd．，Cran．；participial clause explaining the motives of the be－ havior，compare Rom．v．3，Gal．ii．6， Eph．vi．8，al．They recognize in me the appointed defender of the gospel，－ not the incapacitated preacher，whose position claims their help（Est．，Fell 2）， but the energetic apostle whose example quickens and evokes their co－operation． Keíual has thus a purely passive refer－ ence，not＇jaceo in conditione miserû，＇ Van Heng．（a meaning lexically defensi－ ble，sco examples in Rost u．Palm，Lex． S．v．），but＇constitutus sum，＇Fth．，＇I am sct，＇Auth．，Өє́s $\mu \in$ кєұєtрото́vŋкє， Theodoret：so Luke，ii，34， 1 Thess．iii． 3．The apostle was in confinement，but not，as far as we can gather，either in misery or in suffering；compare Conyb． and IIows．St．Paul，，Vol．ir．p． 515 sq． $\dot{\alpha} \pi o \lambda o \gamma\{a \nu \tau \circ \hat{v} \in \dot{U} \alpha \gamma \gamma$ ．is referred by Chrys．，Theoph．，and Eeum．to the account（（càs eủzưvas）of his ministry， which the apostle would have to render up to God，and which tho co－operation of others might render less heavy．This seems artificial：àmo入oyia is nowhere used in the N．T．in reference to God， and can hardly have a different meaning to that which it bears in v． 7 ；see Wie－ scler，Chronol．p． 430 note．

17．of $\delta$ è＇$\xi \xi$＇́pis cías］＇but they （that are）of party－feeling or dissension；＇ opposite class to oi $\mathfrak{\epsilon \xi}$ ảyáarns，ver． 16. On the derivation and true meaning of द＇pıseía，－not exactly＇contention，＇Au－ thor．（comp．Vulg．，Syr．，Copt．），follow－ ed by many modern commentators，but ＇intriguc，＇＇party－spirit＇（àvaıồs karà
 ently felt by Clarom．＇dissensio，＇and perhaps Æeth．，－see notes on Gal．v． 20. On the most suitable translation，comp．
notes on Transl．
$\kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \gamma \gamma$ є́ $\lambda \lambda$ ov $\sigma \iota \nu]$＇declare，＇＇pro－ cluin ；＇in effect not different from $\kappa \in \rho \cup \sigma^{-}$
 Hesych．），but perhaps presenting a little more distinctly the idea of＇promulga－ tion，＇＇making fully known＇（Xenoph． Anab．11．5．11，тเvl тท้̀ ย̇ $\pi \iota ß o v \lambda \eta \nu)$ ； comp． 1 Cor．ix．14，Coloss．i．28，and Acts xvii． 3,23 ，in which latter book the word occurs about ten times．It is pe－ culiar to St．Paul and St．Lukc．In this compound the preposition appears to have an intensive force，as in кara－ $\lambda$ é $\gamma \in เ \nu$ ，кaтaфayєiv к．$\tau . \lambda$. ；see Rost $u$ ． Palm，Lex．s．v．Iv．4．Oủ $\chi$ å $\gamma v \omega \hat{s}$＇insin－ cerely，＇＇with no pure intention，＇（oùr
 ost．），belongs closely to kataरr．，and marks the spirit in which they performed the катarye入ia．On the meaning of á $\gamma$－ pós（＇in quo nihil est impuri＇）see notes on 1 Tim．v．22，and Tittm．Synon．I．p． 22. oí $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \boldsymbol{\nu} 0$ в к．т．$\lambda_{\text {．］}}$ ］ ＇thinking（thus）to raise up，etc．；＇not exactly parallel to eióóres，ver．16，but explanatory of oủx áy $\gamma \omega \bar{\omega}$ ．The verb oleosal seems here to convey a faint idea of intention，though of an intention which was not realized ；e．g．Plato，Apol． 41 D ， оіф $\mu \in \nu$ оь $\beta \lambda \alpha ́ \pi \tau \epsilon เ \nu$（cited by De TV．）；каі
 $\beta \alpha \iota \nu \in \nu$ ，Chrysost．The reading e＇$\gamma \in i \rho \in \iota \nu$ （Rec．èmь申é $\rho \epsilon \nu$ ）is supported not only by the critical principle，＇proclivi lectioni præstat ardua，＇but also by the weight of uncial authority， $\mathrm{ABD}^{1} \mathrm{FG}$ ；so too，three mss．，Vulg，Clarom．，Goth．，al．，and the best modern editors．
Tois $\delta \in \sigma \mu \circ \hat{i} s \mu o v]$＇unto my bonds，＇ dat．incommodi，Jelf，Gr．§602．3；en－ deavoring to make a state already suffi－ ciently full of trouble yet more painful and afflicting．There is some little doubt as to the exact nature of this $\mathfrak{N \lambda}\{\psi t s$ ．Is

## 

it outward，i．e．dangers from the inflamed hatred of heathen enemies（Chrysost．），or inward，i．e．＇trouble of spirit＇（Alford）？ Not the latter，which is not in harmony with the studiedly objective $\delta \in \sigma \mu$ ois，or with the prevailing use of 刃入íuts in the N．T．；－nor yet exactly as Chrys．，al．， which seems too restricted，if not artifi－ cial，but，more prohably，ill－treatment at the hands of Jews and ．Judaiziny Chris－ tians，which the false teaching of the of
 Calvin very prudently obscrves，＇crant plurimæ occasiones［Apostolo nocendi］ que sunt nobis incognite qui temporum circumstantias non tenemus．＇
18．$\tau$ f $\gamma$ áp］＇What then；＇＇quid enim，＇Vulg．，or perhaps more exactly， ＇quid crgo；＇not＇quid igitur，＇Beza， which is not commonly thus used in in－ dependent questions．Tho uses of $\tau$ i ${ }^{\text {à }} \rho$ may be approximately stated as three：（a）argumentative，answering very nearly to the Lat．＇quid enim，＇and while confirming or explaining the preceding sentence，often serving to imply tacitly that an opponent has no answer to make ；see Hand，Tursell．Yol．Ir．p． 386. It is thus often followed by another in－ terrogation；compare Rom．iii．3．Job xxi．4；（b）affirmative；answering very nearly to＇profecto＇or the occasional ＇quid ni＇of the Latins（Hand，Tursell． Vol．Iv．p．186）；compare Eurip．Orest． 481，Soph．CEd．Col．547，and sec Herm． Viger，No．108，and Ellendt，Lex．Soph． Vol．I．p．537，who however has not suf－ ficiently discriminated between the ex－ amples adduced；（c）rhetorical，as ap－ parently here，answering more nearly to ＇quid ergo＇or＇quid ergo est＇（Hand， Tursell．Vol．1I．p．456），and marking commonly cither a startled question（com－ pare $\bigodot$ ©d Col．544，552），or，as here，and apparently Job xviii．4，a brisk transition （＇ubi quis cum alacritate quâdann ad
novam sententiam transgreditur，＇Küh－ ner on Xenoph．Memor．1r．6．2），and thus perhaps differing from the calmer $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ oid $\bar{\nu}$ ．In every one of these cases，how－ ever，the proper force of ráp（＇same pro rebus comparatis＇）though successively becoming more obscure，may still be rec－ ognized；here，for example，the ques－ tion amounts to，＇things being then as I have described them，what is my state of feeling？＇Sce Klotz，Devar．Vol．11． 1． 247 sq．All supplements，òเaф́́ $\rho \in \iota$
 （Van H．），etc．，are perfectly unnecessa－ ry，if not uncritical．
$\pi \lambda \eta \nu]$＇notwithstanding，＇＇nevertheless；＇ this particle，probably connected with $\pi \lambda$ е́ò（Pott，Etym．Forsch．Vol．II．pp． 39，323），not with $\pi$ é $\lambda a s$（Hartung，Par－ til．Vol．Ir．p．30），has properly a com－ parative force，especially recognizable in the disjunctive comparison $\pi \lambda \grave{\eta} \nu$ 方（see Donalds．Ciatyl．§ 100），and its use with the gen．e．g．Mark xii．32，John viii． 10. This might be termed its prepositional use．It however soon passed by an in－ telligible gradation into an adverbial use， and came to imply little more than $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \alpha$, ， ＇nevertheless，＇＇abgesehen davon＇（ch． iii．16．iv．14，I Cor．xi．11，Eph．v．33）， with which particle it is not unfrequently joined；see IKlotz，Devar．Vol．II．p． 725. $\pi \alpha \nu \tau \backslash \tau \rho \delta \pi \omega]$＇in every way，＇scil．of preaching the gospel，more exactly de－ fincd by cïre－e＇ite．At first sight there might seem some difficulty in this lenity of St．Paul towards false，and perhaps heterodox teachers，－men against．whom he warns his converts with such empha－ sis in ch．iii．2．The answer seems rea－ sonable，that St．Paul is here contem－ plating the personal motives rather than alluding to the doctrines of the preach－ ers ；nay，more，that perverted in many respects as this preaching might be， Curist is still its subject，and to tho

## 

large heart of the apostle this is enough ； this swallows up every doubt and fear： ＇let then the word be preached，and let it be heard；be it sincerely，or be it pre－ tensedly，so it be done，it is to him［St． Faul］and should be to us，matter（not only of contentment，but also）of rejoic－ ing，＇Andrewes，Serm．Ix．Vol．v．p． 191 （A．－C．Libr．）；see especially Nean－ der，Plunting，Vol：I．p． 318 （Bohn），and compare Stier，Reden Jesu，Vol．111．p． 29．ЄІँтє $\pi \rho \circ \phi \alpha \sigma \in \iota \kappa$ ．$\tau . \lambda$ ．］ ＇whether in pretence or in truth；＇datives expressive of the manner，technically termed，modal datt．；see Winer，Gr． § 31.6 ，p．193，and especially Jelf，Gr． $\$ 603$ ，by whom this use of the dative is well illustrated ；compare also Hartung， Casus，p．69．The phraseological anno－ tators，especially Wetstein and Raphel （Vol．ir．p．500），adduce numerous in－ stances of a similar opposition between
 are quite enough，independently of the context，to induce us to reject the trans－ lation of $\pi \rho \circ \phi \alpha{ }^{\prime}(\tau \in$ ，adopted by Grot．，al．， ＇occasione，＇i．e．，＇be the good not in－ tended but only occasioned by them，＇ Hammond．On the more general mean－ ing of the here more limited $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \hat{n} \hat{\eta} \in \iota \alpha$ ， compare Reuss，Theol．Chrét．Iv．16， Vol．11．p． $169 . \quad$ モ̇ $\nu \tau$ ои́ $\tau \omega]$ ＇therein，＇＇in this state of things，＇scil． that Christ is preached，though from dif－ ferent reasons ；comp．Luke x．20．This use of $\epsilon \nu \nu$ тоút $\omega$ ，nearly $=$ Germ．＇darü－ ber，＇though apparently not very com－ mon in the best prose，is certainly no Hebraism（Rilliet）；see Winer，Gram． § 48．a，p．346．Meycr compares Plato，
 $\lambda u \pi$ оинévous 方 хaipoдtas．
à $\lambda \lambda \AA$ eal $\chi a p$ ．］＇yea，and $I$ shall re－
 ¡भбооцац，Chrys．，Calv．，but，in more strict connection with the following fut．，when
the $\dot{\alpha} \pi \sigma \beta$ ．єis $\sigma \omega \tau$ ．is being realized．The punctuation is here not quite certain． Lachm．，followed by Tisch．and Meyer， places a full stop before ả $\lambda \lambda \alpha \alpha^{\prime}$ ，and a co－ lon after $\chi a p$ ．，thus connecting oij $\delta \alpha$ خàp more immediately with the present clause．This seems right in principle both on grammatical，as well as exeget－ ical，considerations ：a colon，however， as in text，seems preferable to a full stop， for there is a kind of sequence in the $\chi$ aip $\omega$ and $\chi a p \eta \dot{\sigma} \sigma \mu a t$ which can hardly be completely interrupted．De W．，Van Heng．，and others who retain the com－ ma（Alford has a comma in text but a colon in translation），suppose an ellip－ sis of où $\mu \dot{\nu} \nu o \nu$ before xaípo．This is very unsatisfactory．＇A入入̀े kal has here its idiomatic meaning＇at etiam，＇the faintly seclusive force of $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \alpha{ }_{\alpha}$ serving specially to confine attention to the new assertion which the kal annexes and en－ hances；see Fritz．Rom．vi．5，Vol．1．p． 374．It may be observed that in these words，and also in some uses of the idi－ omatic $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \gamma \alpha \dot{\rho} \rho, \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \mu \in ́ \nu$ ，the primary force of à入入̀े（＇aliud jam hoc esse de quo sumus dicturi，＇Klotz，Devar．Vol．Ir．p． 2）is so far obscured that it does practi－ cally little more than impart a briskness and emphasis to the declaration ；see Klotz，l．c．，p．8，Hartung，Partilc．Vol． 11．p．35．Lastly，we should be careful to distinguish between the present use of d̉ $\lambda \lambda \alpha{ }^{2}$ кal and（a）where a hypothetical clause precedes，evoking a more distinct opposition，e．g． 1 Cor．iv．15， 2 Cor，iv． 16；（b）where an opposition is involved in the terms themselves；e．g．Diod．Sic．v．
 $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu$＇A ${ }^{2}(\alpha \nu$ ；or（c）wherc $\alpha \lambda \lambda \lambda \alpha$ occurs in brisk exhortation，e．g．Soph．Philoct．
 which passage Hermann＇s proposed emendation тt શápoos does not seem either plausible or necessary．

## 

19. oi $\delta \alpha \gamma d \rho]$ Confirmation of the words immediately preceding, the $\gamma$ áp having its simple argumentative force. If with Calv., Bisp., al. this clause be referred to ver. 17 , $\gamma$ à $\rho$ must have more of an explanatory force (comp: notes on Gal. ii. 6) : such a ref., however, is unduly regressive; roû̃o here can only mean the same as roúte ver. 19 , - the more extended preaching of the gospel of Christ. The words roviтo- $\sigma \omega$ тppiay occur in Job xiii. 16, and may have been a reminiscence.
$\sigma \omega \tau \eta \rho[\alpha \nu]$ ' lo salvation.' The exact meaning of $\sigma \omega \tau \eta p i ́ a$ has been very differently explained. It hats been referred to (a) 'salus corporea,' scil. 'escape from present danger,' 'à $\pi \alpha \lambda \lambda a \gamma \dot{\eta} \nu$, Chrys., who however fluctuates ; 'preservation in
 and apparently Syr. ; (b)'salus spiritualis,' 'Scelenheil,' De Wette, 'his own fruitfulness to Christ,' Alford ; (c) both united, 'for good, whether of soul (Rom. viii. 28) or of body' (Acts xxvii. 34), Peile, Bloomf.; (d) 'salus sempiterna,' whether ( $\alpha$ ) in reference to others (Grot., Hamm.), or ( $\beta$ ) in ref. to himself, 'suam salutem veram et perennem,' Van Heng. The last of these meanings alone secms to satisfy the future referenco ( $\dot{a} \pi o \beta$.), and is most in accordance with the prevailing meaning of $\sigma \omega \tau \eta \rho_{i}$ in St. Paul's Epistles : compare ver. 28, ch. ii. 12, and tis $\sigma \omega \tau$. Rom. i. 16, 2 Thess. ii. 13.
$\delta i \dot{\alpha} \tau \hat{\eta} s \kappa . \tau . \lambda$.$] 'through your suppli-$ cation and the supply of the spirit of J. C.;' the two means by which the $\sigma \omega \tau \eta p i a$ is to be realized, intercessory supplication on the part of man, and supply of the Spirit on the part of God. Moyer and Alford regard the gen. èmiXop $\begin{gathered}\text { rias as }\end{gathered}$ dependent on $\dot{v} \mu \omega \bar{\nu}$, 'your supply to mc (by that prayer) of, etc.,' on the ground that $\delta i \alpha$ ก $\tau \hat{s}$, or at least $\tau \hat{\eta} s$ would have been inserted. Independently of the very
unsatisfactory meaning in a dogmatical point of view, this is not grammatically exact. No article is required. Each substantive has its own defining genitive, and ou this account the second may dispense with its article; so Winer, Gr. $\$ 19.5$, p. 118 (ed. 6). Meyer is unfortunate in referring to Winer in support of his interpretation, as that grammarian expressly adopts the more natural construction. ${ }^{2} \pi \iota \chi \circ \rho \eta \gamma^{i} \alpha s$ rôv $\Pi \nu$.] 'supply of the Spirit.' These words admit of two interpretations according as $\tau 0 \hat{v} \Pi \nu$. is considered a gen. objecti or subjecti ; compare Winer, Gr. § 30. 1, p. 168. If the former, the meaning will be, 'the supply which is the Spirit,' the genitive being that of identity or apposition (Scheuerl. Synt. § 12. 1, p. 82, 83) ; so Chrysost.; Theoph., Gecum. If the latter, the meaning will be the 'supply which the Spirit gives,' the gen. being that of the origin or agent (Hartung, Casus, p. 17) ; so Theodoret, De W., Mcy. This latter interpretation is on the whole to be preferred, as the parallclism, 'the prayers you offer - the aid the Spirit supplies,' is thus more exactly retained. Wiesing. and Alf. urge Gal. iii. 5, but this can hardly be considered sufficiently in point to fix the interpretation. Still less tenable is the assertion that the gen. subjecti would have re-
 in Eph. iv. 16 (Alford) ; for in the first place examples of the contrary (and indeed, usual) order are most abundant, see Scheuerl. Synt. p. 126, Winer, Gr. p. 167 ; and in the next place the gen. in Eph. l. c. is confessedly of a different grammatical elass; see notes in loc. The Spirit is here termed $\tau \delta$ $\Pi \nu$. ${ }^{2} I \eta \sigma$. X $\rho$., not merely because Christ gives Himself spiritually in and with the Holy Ghost (Moyer on Rom. viii. 9), but because that eternal Spirit proceeds from the Son ; so

Pearson, Creed, Vol. I. p. 383: in a word the genitive is not so much a definitive or quasi-possess. gen., as a simple genitive originis, Hartung, Cosus, p. 23. Lastly, on énixoppria, which perhaps retains a slight shade of the primary meaning of $\chi \circ \rho \eta \gamma$. in the ampleness and liberality which it seems to lrint at on the part of the gift and giver, see notes on Coloss. ii. 19, and Llarless on Ephes. iv. 16. The $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \grave{l}$ is directire, not intensive; see notes on Eph. l. c.
20. кат $\dot{\alpha} \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \dot{\alpha} \pi$ окар.] 'accorcling to my expectation,' sc. 'even as I am hoping and expecting;' Syr., 'sicut speravi et confisus sum,' Weth. The curious worl $\mathfrak{\alpha} \pi о к а р а д о к i ́ a ~(H e s y c h . ~ т р о б \delta о-~$ кí $\alpha$, ċmєк $\delta o \chi \hat{\eta})$ only here and Rom. viii. 19 in the N. T., is derived from kápa, and $\delta о к \epsilon \in \omega$ [possibly allied to a root dic, 'monstrare,' Pott, Etym. Forsch. Vol. I. p. 185, 267] and properly denotes 'capitis, scil. oculorum animique ad rem ab aliquo loco expectandam attenta conversio,' and thence derivatively 'patient, persistent, looking for' (Rom. viii. 19), and, with a further weakened force, 'calm expectation,' as in this place; the meaning necessarily varying with that of the simple карабокєiv, which, from the ideas of 'attention' (Eur. Troad. 93) and 'observation' (Polyb. Hist. x. 42. 6), passes to those of 'suspense' (Eur. Mcd. 1117) and simple 'expectation' (Eur. Iph. Aul. 1433). The prep. $\dot{\alpha} \pi \delta$ is not properly intensive, as in $\alpha \pi 0 \grave{\tau} \epsilon 16 \omega$, àro廿év́ouat, к. т. $\lambda$. ('Tittm. Synon. p. 106 sq., and even Meyer on Rom. viii. 19), but local: it primarily (so to say) localizes the карабิокєîv, by marking cither (a) the place from which the observation is maintained, e.g. Joseph. Bell. Jud. III. 7. 26, comp. Polyb. Hist. XviIv. 31. 4, or• (b) the quarter whence the thing or issue is looked for, e. g. Polyb. Hist. xVI. 2. 8, -and comes thence, as in
à $\pi \epsilon \kappa \delta$ é $\chi$ oual (Germ. 'abwarten,' sce notes on Gal. v. 5), with a gradual, but intelligible, evanescence of the local irkea (' quidquid enim expectes alicunde te id expectare oportet,' Fritz.), to imply little more than the fixedness, permanence, and patience (not 'solicitude,' 'iltm.) with which the observation is continued, or the expectation entertained; see Winer, de Verb. Compos. Iv. p. 14, and especially the excellent discussion of Fritz. Frilzsch. Opusc. pp. 150-157.
ö $\tau \iota \epsilon \mathcal{L}$ o $\dot{u} \delta \in \nu l$ ai $\sigma \chi$.] 'that in nothing $I$ shall ble put to shame.' These words admit of various possible interpretations ; for example (a) ötı may be either relatival, 'that,' $\tau \delta$ ė̉ $\pi i \zeta \epsilon เ \nu$ ö $\tau \iota$, Chrys., or argumentative, 'because,' 'quia,' Vulg., Clarom. ; (b) ov̉ $\delta \in \nu$ may be either neuter (Syr., Auth., al.), or masculine in reference to the preachers of the gospel (Hoelem.) ; again (c) ai $\sigma \chi$ vis. may be cither passive, 'confundar,' Vulg., or with a middle force, 'pudore confusus, ab officio deflectam,' Van Hengel. In this variety of interpretation we must be guided solely by the context: and this seems certainly in favor of the above translation; for ( $a$ ) örı far more naturally follows ě $\lambda \pi เ s$ as defining the subject to which it refers (comp. Rom. viii. 21) than as supplying the reason why it is entertained; the latter interrupts the sequence, vitiates the logic, and leaves the object of hope undefined. Again, (b) oú $\delta \in \nu \dot{l}$ cannot be masculine ; for if so, it would have to be arbitrarily referred only to the better class of those mentioner above, whereas if neuter it remains perfectly general and inclusive, not merely
 - but, 'in no respect, in no particular' (comp. ver. 28), thus forming an antith-
 cannot logically be taken with any middle force; St. Paul can scarcely know



that the preaching will turn out to his salvation, and yet only hope and expect that he shall not fall from his duty. What the apostle does hope and expect is, not merely öt oủ тєpléซovzal oủTot,
 $\rho \bar{\nu} \nu$, Theod., but more generally, that he shall not be brought to a state of shame (2 Cor. x. 8, 1 John ii. 28), that he shall not fail in the highest duties and aims of his life ; sce De Wette in loc., who aptly compares the Hebrew שitit Psalm xxxiv. 5 (LXX. катаเ $\chi \cup v \stackrel{\imath}{n})$, lxix. 2 (LXX. ai $\sigma \chi \nu \nu \uparrow$ cín $\sigma \alpha \nu$ ), and contrasts St. Paul's

$\dot{\alpha} \cdot \lambda \lambda^{\prime} \quad \dot{\epsilon} \nu \operatorname{rr}^{\alpha} \sigma \eta \pi \alpha \beta \bar{\beta}$.]' 'but (on the contrary) in all boldness;' antithesis to the foregoing clause introduced with the full force of the adversative $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \alpha^{\prime}$. П $\alpha \sigma \eta$, as has often been remarked (see ver. 9), is not qualitative, 'une pleine liberte,' Rill., but, as usual, quantitative, 'every form and manifestation of boldness,' forming an exact opposition to $\epsilon^{\prime} \nu$ ov̀ $\delta \in \nu l$ above. ' $\mathrm{E} \nu \pi \alpha \beta{ }^{2} \rho \eta \sigma^{\prime}$ a is thus not merely 'in joyfulness' (Wiesing., comp. Eph. iii. 12), and certainly not $\sigma \alpha \phi \hat{\omega}$ s $\phi \alpha \nu \in \rho \omega \bar{s}$,
 [revelatâ facie], but, as the contrast and context both imply, 'in fiduciâ,' Vulg., 'in boldness of speech and action;' comp. Eph. vi. 19.
©́s $\pi \alpha \nu \tau 0 \tau \epsilon \kappa \alpha i \nu \hat{v} \nu$ ] Tomporal clause, following close on the foregoing modal predication (comp. Donalds. Gr. § 444). The addition kal $\nu \bar{\nu} \nu$ gives a dignifying and consoling aspect to the apostle's present condition, cheerless as it might seem, and supplies a retrospective corroboration of ver. 12.
$\mu \in \gamma \alpha \lambda v \nu \hat{N} \dot{\eta} \sigma \in \tau \alpha \iota \in \mathcal{\epsilon} \nu \bar{\psi} \sigma \dot{\omega} \mu$.] 'shall be magnified in my body;' not èv ėuoí,
but, in accordance with the studiedly passive aspect given to the whole declaration (obscured by EEth.), - $\epsilon \nu \tau \hat{\varphi} \sigma \omega \dot{\omega} \mu$., 'in my body;' 'my body shall be, as it were, the theatre on which Christ's glory shall be displayed,' comp. John xxi. 19 ; and in illustration of this use of $\varepsilon \nu$ ('substratum of action') see notes on Gal. i. 24, Winer, Gr. § 48. a, p. 345, M $\operatorname{l} \gamma \mathrm{a}$. is thus not 'shall be enlarged,' 'augebitur,' Copt. (comp. Luke i. 58, 2 Cor. $x$. 15), with reference to the development and growth of Christ within (Rill. ; compare Gal. ii. 20, Rom. viii. 10), which here would not larmonize with the modal $\frac{e}{2} \nu \pi a p \hat{p}$. , and still less with the local '̇ $\nu \sigma \dot{\omega} \mu$, , - but, as in Acts xix. 17, 'shall Le ulorifici,' $\delta \in \iota \chi$ Зijoetat ös द̇ $\sigma \tau \iota$, Theod., 'gloriosior apparebit,' Just., the meaning being here appy, a little more forcible than 'be praised ' (Alf. ; comp. Lk. i. 46, Acts v. 13) and pointing more to the gencral, than to the merely oral spread of the Lord's glory and kinglom among men. $\epsilon \not ้ \tau \in \delta \iota \alpha$ к. т. 入.] 'whelher by life or by death;' two alternatives, suggested by. and in explanation of the preceding e $\nu$ $\sigma \dot{\omega} \mu a \pi \iota$; 'in my body,'-whether that body be preserved alive as an earthly in. strument of my Master's glory, or be given up to martyrdom for His name's

 бaбNal aủtóv, Chrys. Well then might the apostle say oỉa ötc...eis $\sigma \omega \tau \eta p i a y$ when he could entertain a hope and an expectation so unspeakably blessed. The whole verse, and especially this clause, is strongly confirmatory of the fuller meaning of $\sigma \omega \tau \eta p i=$.
21. $\left.\epsilon \mu{ }^{2}{ }^{2} \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho\right]$ Confirmation and clucidation of the last clause of v .20 . The à̀ has no ref. to any omitted clause (B1.),


- ever a doubtful and precarious mode of explaining this particle, - but simply confirms the preceding assertion by showing the real nature of ऽ $\omega \hat{\eta}$ and ióvatos, according to the apostle's present mode of regarding them ; 'in my view and definition of the term, life is but another name for Christ,' Peile. The emphatic énol (' to me, in my merely personal capacity;' see Wiesinger) is thus the pronominal dative judicii (Do W.), or perhaps more correctly and more inclusively, the dative of ethical relation (comp. Gal. vi. 14) ; not merely 'in my estimation,' but 'in my case,' 'life in my realization of it,' - a dative which is allied to, and more fully developed in, the dative commodi or incommodi; see Bernhardy, Synt. III. 9, p. 85, and especially Krüger, Sprachl. §48.6. 1 sq., by whom this use of the dative is well illustrated.
$\tau \delta$ § $\hat{\eta} \nu \mathrm{X} p<\sigma \tau \delta s]^{\prime}$ 'to live is Christ,' i. e. living consists only in union with, and devotion to, Christ ; my whole being and activities are His ; 'quicquid vivo Christum vivo,' Beng. : see Gal. ii. 20, but observe the difference of the application; there the reference is to faith, here rather to works (De W.), the context showing that Xpıatos, beside the idea of union with Him, must also involve that of derotion to His service. So, perhaps too distinctly, Ath. (compare Calv.) 'si vixcro, Christo.' Toे S欠̂̀ $\nu$ is clearly the subject ('vita mea,' Syriac, Copt.), the natural life alluded to in the preceding, and moro specifically in the following verse. It cannot refer to spiritual life (Rill., comp. Chrys., Theoph.) as the antithesis, $\zeta \bar{\eta} \nu-\alpha{ }^{2} \pi o s$. , is thus obscured, and the argument impaired: what (wi) is in ver. 20 , that must $\tau \delta \zeta \bar{\eta} \nu$ be here.
$\kappa \alpha \grave{\iota} \tau \boldsymbol{\alpha} \pi 0$ N. $\kappa$ є́p $\delta o s$ ] 'and [simple copulative] to die is gain ;' death is gain, as I shall thus enjoy a still nearer and more blessed union with my Lord ; $\sigma \alpha=$
$\phi \epsilon ́ \sigma t \in \rho o \nu$ aivtê $\sigma v \nu \epsilon \in \sigma o \mu a l$, Chrys., Theoph. Képóos belongs only to this latter clause, the full meaning of which is very easily collected from the context ; compare verse 23. To make X $\rho$, the subject to both members of the sentence and $\tau \delta$ $\zeta \hat{\eta} \nu$ and $\tau \delta$ àmô. accusatives of 'reference to' (Krüger, Sprachl. §46. 4), sc. 'ut tam in vitâ quam in morte lucrum esse predicetur' (Calv. ; compare Beza), is to mar the perspicuity, and to introduce a difficulty in point of grammar, as Tठ ḋ $\pi 0$ 's. could scarcely be 'in moriendo:' such accusatives commonly point to things or actions which may, so to say, be conceived as extensible, and over the whole of which the predication can range ; see Scheuerl. Synt. § 9. 3, p. 68, Krüger, Sprachl. §46.4.1. Numerous examples of similar expressions are cited by Wetstein in loc., the most pertinent of which is Joseph. Bell. vir. 8, 6, $\sigma u \mu$ -
 as it hints at the purely substantival character of rठ $\zeta \hat{\eta} \nu(\mathrm{ppp}$, to $\Lambda l \mathrm{f}$.) and $\tau \delta$ a moiaveiv. The practical aspects of the subject will be found in Heber, Serm. xvi. xvir.

22. $\epsilon i$ ' $\delta \dot{\epsilon} \tau \delta$ § $\hat{\eta} \nu$ к. т. $\lambda$.] 'but if my living in the flesh, - if this is to me the (the medium of ) fruit from my labor;' so Vulg., Claroman., Goth., and (with obscured $\tau 0 \hat{\tau} \tau u)$ Syr., Copt. : antithetical sentence suggested by the remembrance of his calling as an apostle. There are difficulties in this verse in the individual expressions, as well as in the connection and sequence of thought. We will (1) briefly notice the former: (a) ci is not problematical, 'if it chance,' Tyndale, Cranm., but as Meyer correctly observes, syllogistic, - and virtually assertory. ( $\beta$ ) The addition é $\nu$ oapkl does not imply any qualitative difference between $\tau \delta \zeta \eta \bar{\eta} \nu$ here and $\tau \delta$ 万 $\eta \nu$ in ver. 21 (Rill.), but guards against it being understood in tho

hiyher sense，which the preceding $\tau \delta$ dे àos． $\kappa$ ќpoos（＇to die，i．e．to live out of the flesh with Christ，is gain＇）might other－ wise seem naturally to suggest．（ $\gamma$ ） Toû̃o is not a redundancy＇per Hebrais－ nnum＇（see Glasse，Phil．Sacr．p． 738 ［219］），but is designed to give special prominence and emphasis to the idea contained in the preceding words ；com－ pare Winer，Gr．§44．4，p．144．（（ס）In kapids fypoo the genitive is not a gen．of apposition，＇opus pro fiuctu habet，＇Ben－ gel，nor a gen．oljecti，＇profit for the work＇（Rill．），but a simple gen．suljecti ［originis］，＇proventus operis，＇De Wette，年 meis］Syr．，i．e．＇convers with it，is the condition of fruit from apostolical labor，＇ the épron referring to the laborious nature of the apostolic work（ （cts xiii．2， 1 Thess．v．15， 2 Tim．iv．5）；картофор⿳⺈，
 comp．Raphel，Ols．Vol．11．p． 622.
（2）The connection then seems to be as follows：in verse 21 the apostlo had spoken of life and death from a strictly personnt point of view（ ${ }^{2} \mu \mathrm{~m}$ i）；in this as－ pect death was gain．The thought，how－ ever，of his official labors reminds him that lis life bears blessings and fruitful－ ness to others；so he pauses ；＇oljjectà spe conversionis multorum，heret atque hæsitat，＇Just．：so，in substance，The－ oplyyl．（who has explained this clause briefly and perspieuously），Chrys．，＇The－ odoret，©ccumen．，and after them，with some variations in detail，Dc W．，Meycr， and the best modern editors．Of the other interpretations the most plansible is（a）that of Auth．，Beng．，al．，accord－ ing to which toûto \％．T．$\lambda$ ．forms the ap－ odosis，$\grave{\varepsilon} \sigma \tau!\mu 0 t$ being supplied after $\epsilon^{2} v$ oapkt，＇but if I live in the flesh，this is，＇ etc．；the least so（ ）that of Beza，Gener． （amended by Conyb．，but satisfactorily
answered by Alf．），according to which $\epsilon i$ is＇whether，＇and кapmos＇prou＝＇operæ pretium＇（comp．Grot．，IIamm．，Schole－ field，Hints；p．105，－a more than doubt－ ful translation），scil．＇and whether to live in the flesh were profitable to me， and what，＇etc．The objjection to（a）is the very harsh and unustall nature of the ellipsis；to（b），independently of gram－ matical objections，the lialting and incon－ sequent nature of the argument ；sec Alf．
 к．т．ג．］＇then，or why，what I am to choose ［observe the middle］I linow not；＇apo－ dosis to the furegoing．The principal difficulty lies in the use of kal．Though no certain example of an exactly similar use of $\epsilon i-$ kal has been adduced from the N．T．（2 Cor．ii． 2 ［De Wette］is not in point，being thero the kal of rapid inter－ rogation，Hartung，Partik．Vol．I．p． 147），yet the use of кal at the beginning of the apodosis is so common（sce Bri－ dor，Conc．s．v．кaí，D，p．455）as to ren－ der such a use after $e l$ by no means im－ probable；see examples in Hartung， Partil．s．v．kal，2．6，Vol．i．p．130，and cempare the somewhat similar use of ＇atque，＇Hand，Tursell．Vol．I．p． 481 sq． In such eases the proper force of кail is not wholly lost．Just as，in brief logical sentences，it constantly implics that if one thing be true，then another will be

 Anim．cl．3，p． 9 （ed．Bekk．），一so here， if lifc certainly subserve to apostolic use－ fulness，there will culso be a difficulty as to choice．It is thus unnecessary to as－ sume any aposiopesis after the first mem－ ber，scil．＇non repugno，＇＇non wgro fero，＇ Müller，Rill．There is only a slight． pause，and slight change from the ex－ pected，to a more emphatic sequence， which this semi－ratiocinative kal very ap－ propriately introduces．

On
the use of the less exact $\tau^{\prime}$ for $\pi \delta \dot{\sigma} \tau \rho \rho \mathrm{v}$ ， see Winer，Gr．§ 25.1, p． 153 （ed．6）； and on that of the future in a delibera－ tive clause，Winer，ib．§ 41．4．b．p． 267. The strict alliance between the future and the subjunctive renders such atu in－ terchange very intelligible．
o ủ $\gamma \nu \omega \mathrm{p}$ โ S $\omega$ ］＇I do not recognize，＇＇I do not clearly perceive，＇－a somerwhat excep－ tional use in the N．T．of $\gamma \nu \omega \rho$ ．，which is nearly always＇notum facio．＇For examples of the present use，see Ast， Lex．Plat．s．v．；comp．Job xxxiv． 25 （Lxx），iv． 16 （Symm．）．
23．$\sigma \nu \nu$＇$\chi$ о $\mu$ а ८ $\delta$ є к．к．$\lambda$ ．］＇yea，$I$ am held in a strait ly the two ；＇antitheti－ cal explanation of the last member of verse 22 ；the fuintly oppositive $\delta$（not ＇metabatic＇［Meyer］on the one hand， nor equivalent to $\alpha \lambda \lambda \alpha{ }_{\alpha}$ on the other） placing the emphatic $\sigma v \nu$ é $\chi o \mu \alpha$, in gentle contrast with the preceding ou $\gamma \nu a p i\} \omega$ ． The reading $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$（Rcc．）has scarcely any critical support，and is only a correction of the less understood $\delta \epsilon$ ．On the real difference between these two particles in sentences like the present，see especially Klotz，Devar．Vol．11．p．363．The prep． $\hat{\epsilon}^{\kappa} \kappa$ is here not used for àmó（Bloomf．）， nor yet for $\delta$ tá（ Ieinr．，－instrumentality would have been expressed by a simple dative，e．g．Mattl．is．24，Luke viii．37， Acts xviii．5，xxviii．8），but with its proper force points to the origin of the ovvo㐅 $\eta$ ，the sources out of which it arises； see notes on Gal．ii．16，where the uses of this preposition in N．T．are briefly noticed．Lastly，the article is not mros－ pective（compare Syr．）but retrospectice （Mey．，al．），referring to the two alterna－ tives previously mentioned．This is confirmed by the apparent emphasis on $\sigma u \nu^{\prime} \chi$ ．，and the illustrative connection with it of the two classes which follow．
 desire；＇not merely＇a desire，＇Author．，
nor＇the desire previously alluded to，＇ Hocl．，－as no èmเงิvuia，strictly spouking， has been alluded to，－but＇the desire which I now feel，＇＇my desire．＇The èmıง̂uula thus stands absolutely．its direc－ tion being defined in the words which follow．A very eloquent and feeling application of this text will be found in Manning，Serm．xx．Vol．III．p． 370 sq． $\epsilon$ is $\tau \grave{\partial} \dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha \lambda \hat{v} \sigma \alpha \iota]$＇ towards depart－ ing，＇＇turned to departure；＇not＇desid－ crium solvendi＇（ toû àva入．，Origen，in a fice citation），nor even quite，＇the desire to depart，＇Conyb．（comp．Winer，Gr． §44．6，p．294），－both of which would seem to imply the not unusual definitive genitive after $\mathfrak{e} \pi t \stackrel{0}{ }$ ．（comp．Thucyd．vir．
 force of the preposition eis，＇desidcrio tendens ad dimissionem；＇compare Wi－ ner，Gr．§49．a，p．354．The preposi－ tion is omitted in DEFG；Chrysostom （comm．），apparently by accident，as the construction would not thus be made more easy．＇Ava入र$\sigma a t$ is not＇dissolvi，＇
Vulg，nor even＇liberari，＇Syr． i－$_{\Delta}$ osos （comp．Schoettg．in loc．），but，perhaps with primary reference to breaking up a camp or loosing an anchor，＇migrare，＇ Eth．（comp．Judith xiii．1，Elian，Var＇． Hist．Iv．23），and thence with a shade of meaning imparted by the context， ＇discedere a vitû，＇$\grave{\eta}$ ย̇ $\nu \tau \epsilon \hat{v} \hat{\imath} \epsilon \nu$ à $\pi a \lambda \lambda a \gamma \dot{\eta}$, Theod．；compare notes on 2 Tim．iv．6， and sce Suicer，Thesaur．Vol．1．p． 286 sq．，by whom this word is copiously il－ lustrated；add too Pcrizonius，on Elian， Var．Ilist．l．c．The translation adopted by＇Tertull．＇recipi＇has perhaps refer－ ence to the＇receptui canere，＇and is thus virtually the same ；comp．Mill．，Prole－ goim．p．Lxvir． кal $\sigma$ ì $\nu$ $\mathrm{X} \rho . \in \tilde{I} \nu \alpha$,$] From the immediate con－$ nection of this clause with ảvà $\bar{v} \sigma a \iota$ dog－ matical deductions have been made in

## 


reference to the intermediate state ; 'clare ostenditur animas sanctorum ex hâe vità sine peccato migrantium statim post mortem esse cum Christo,' Est. ; comp. Cyrill.-Alex. cited by Forbes, Instruct. xiri. 8. 33, Bull, Engl. Worlss, p. 42 (Oxf., 1844), Reuss, Theol. Chret. 1v. 21, Vol. 11. p. 240. Without presuming to make hasty deductions from isolated passages, we may safely rest on the broad and sound opinion of Bishop Pearson, that life eternal may be regarded as initial, partial, and perfectional, and that the blessed apostle is now in the fruition of that second state, and 'is with Christ who sitteth at the right hand of God,' Creed, Art. xir. Vol. 1. p. 467 , and compare Polyc. ad Phyl. § 9, eis тòv ỏ óє $\lambda \delta_{0}$ $\mu \in \nu 0 \nu$ av̉roîs тóтоу єíal тapà Kupí $\varphi$, Clem. Rom. 1 Cor. § 5, є̀ $\pi о \rho \in \cup ́ \nexists \eta$ [ $\Pi$ érpos] eis
 trary view, see Burnet, State of Departed, ch. III. p. 58 ; and lastly, for a practical application of the verse, Farindon, Serm. xxxyr. Vol, II. p. 1006 (edit. 1672). The meaning involved in the words $\sigma \dot{\nu} \nu$ Xp. eival, in reference to the soul's incorporeal state, is explained profoundly, though perhaps somewhat singulary, by Hofmann, Schrifib. II. 2, Vol. 1r. p. 449, 'selbst kürperlos, wird er clen Leib, in welchem die Fülle der Gottheit wohnt, zu sciner Wohnung haben;' comp. Delitzsch, Bibl. Psychol. vi. 6, p. 383 sq. $\pi о \lambda \lambda \hat{\omega} \gamma \grave{\alpha} \rho \kappa . \tau . \lambda$.$] 'for it is very far$ better,' scil. being with Christ is so (for me); explanation of the foregoing desire. The comparative strengthened by $\mu \hat{a} \lambda \lambda o \nu$ gives a force and energy to the assertion that is here very noticeable and appropriate ; compare Mark vii, 36, 2 Cor. vii. 13, and Winer, Gr. § 35. 1, p. 214. The reading is somewhat doubtful : $\gamma$ àp is omitted by DEFGKL; great majority of mss., several VV . and some Ff.
(Rec., Griesb. but om. om.) ; as, however, it is found in $\mathrm{ABC} ; 31.67$ 米; Copt. ; Or. (1), Bas., Aug. (often and explic. as 1)1FG show in this passage marks of incertitudo in reading $\pi o ́ \sigma \omega$ for $\pi 0 \lambda \lambda \hat{\omega}$, and lastly, as $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ might have been thoughtto interrupt the sequence, we may perhaps safely acquiesce in the insertion with Lachm., Tisch., and even Elz, and Scholz.
24. $\tau \delta \delta \delta$ غ̀ $\epsilon \pi t \mu \epsilon ' \nu \in \Delta \nu \kappa . \tau . \lambda$.$] ' yet$ to tarry in my flesh.' In the former verse the apostle stated what is крєiöov, for himself, now le turns to what is ávarкatótєpov in regard of his converts. $\Delta$ ' is thus simply 'but,' 'yet,' - scarcely 'nevertheless,' Auth., which is commonly a more suitable translation of $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \alpha \alpha^{:}$on the difference between these particles ('verum - sed '), see Kilotz, Devar. Vol. Ir. pp. 33, 361. The $\overline{\epsilon \pi l}$ in $\bar{\epsilon} \pi t \mu$. implies rest in a place (comp. notes on Gal. i. 18), and hints at a more protracted stay ; compare Rom. vi. 1. The next words èv $\tau \hat{?}$ бapkl are, as Meyer correctly observes, scarcely quite the same as é $\nu$ बapil in ver. 22 ; there the expression was general, here more specific and individualizing ; see Krüger, Sprachl. § 50. 2. 3.

$\delta \iota^{\prime} \quad \delta \mu$ â $s$ ]. ' more ncedful on your account ;' not an inexact comparative (De W.), nor to be diluted into a positive (Clarom., compare Syr.), nor with reference to the apostle's own feelings, scil. 'quam ut meo desiderio satisfiat,' Van Heng., Bengel, - but simply 'more necdful,' scil. than the contrary course, than $\dot{\alpha} \nu a \lambda \hat{v} \sigma \alpha$, к. т. $\lambda$. This latter course St. Faul might have thought ảvayкaîov on his own account, a thing to be prayed for and hastened; continuance, however, was àvayicatót $\rho \rho \frac{\nu}{}$ on account of his converts. The meaning proposed by Locsin., 'præstat, 'melius est' (comp. .Eth.), has

## 


#### Abstract

25. $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \mu \in \nu \hat{\omega}]$ So Lachm. with ABCD1FG; 5 mas.; Vulg., Clarom. ; Lat. Ff. (approved by Griesb., Alf.). Tisch. reads $\sigma u \mu \pi \alpha \rho \alpha \mu \in \nu \hat{\omega}$, appy. only with DekKL; majority of mss. ; Chrys. (expressly), Theul., Dam., Theophrl., al. (Rirc., Schulz, Mey.). While on the one hand, it is possible that the unusual compound might have been changed into the more simple form, still, on the other hand, the dative $\pi \hat{\alpha} \sigma \iota \nu$ might have suggested the insertion. The uncial authority is moreover far too preponderant to be safely reversed.


no lexical authority, and is not supported by the examples adduced Obs. p. 353.
25. кal $\tau$ оиิтo $\pi \in \pi 0 เ \hat{\imath} \omega \mathrm{~s}$ ] 'And being persuaded, being sure, of this;' scil.,
 necessary on your account. Пєтоเิิติs has thus its natural force and regimen (ver. 6), and is not to be explained away

 Syr., Goth., Copt., or blended with oi $\delta \alpha$ ( (Eth.), but is to be closely connected with roûto, while oiōa is joined only with ถ̈т ; 'persuadens mihi vitam meam vobis esse [magis] necessariam, scio quod Deus me robis adhuc concedet,' Corn. a Lap. oi $\delta \alpha$ ] ' $I$ linow;' not with any undue emphasis, 'prevideo,' Van Heng., for see ch. ii. 17, but simply 'I know.' sc. it is my present feeling and conviction; compare Acts xx. 25. For somewhat analogous uses of oif $\delta$, see the examples adduced by Van Heng., but observe that even in the strongest (Hom. Il. vr. 447) oida still refers more to the persuasions of the speaker than to any absolutely prophetic certitude.
$\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \mu \in \nu \hat{\omega}]$ 'continue here (on earth),' 'bleiben und dubleiben,' Meyer, who aptly cites Herod. I. 30, тéкга є̇күєעठ$\mu \in \nu \alpha$ каl $\pi \alpha ́ \nu \tau \alpha$ т $\pi \rho a \mu \epsilon i v a \nu \tau \alpha$; add Plato,


 the reading see critical note. The dative Țิ̂atv $\dot{\mu} \mu \hat{i} \nu$ may be the dative of interest, 'to support and comfort you' (Krüger,

Sprachl. § 48. 4), but is here far more naturally governed by the mapà in the compound ; see Plato, Pheed. l. c., Apol: p. 39 e, apparently Protag. p. 335 D, and contrast 1 Cor. xvi. 6 , $\pi \rho \partial s$ víuâs $\pi a \rho a-$ $\mu \in \nu \hat{\omega}$, where the $\pi \rho \partial s$ gains its force from the intended journey to them just before mentioned ; here the apostle is mentally with those he is addressing. This is a somewhat more common regimen than Krüger (Sprachl. §48.11.9) seems inclined to admit.
สis $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ v $\mu \hat{\omega} \nu \kappa . \tau . \lambda_{\text {. ] 'for your fur- }}$ therance in, and joy of the faith;' not 'for your furth., and for your joy,' etc., Van Heng., -there being here no reason whatever to depart from the ordinary rule ; see Winer, Gr. § 19. 4. d, p. 116; and comp. Middleton, Gr. Art: p. 368. It is scarcely necessary to say that there is not here any kind of inversion ('for your joy and for the increase of your faith') as Syriac, nor any disjunction (' for your furth.; and for your faith, and for your joy'), as in AEth., nor any conjunction (' for the advancement of the joy of your faith'), as Macknight: still the relation of the genitive to the two substantives scems slightly different; in the first case it is a gen. subjecti, referrible perhaps to the class of the possess. gen. ; in the latter it is a gen. originis, 'quod cx fide promanat,' Zanch., and belongs to the general division of the gen. of ablation; compare Scheuerl. Synt. § 11. 1, p. 79, Donalds. Gr. § 448 sq. On $\chi$ apá, compare Reuss, Theol. Chret. Iv. 18; Vol. 1I. p. 202, whose definition how-

 $\pi a ́ \lambda \iota \nu ~ \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ v ̌ \mu a ̂ s . ~$

Live as becometh the gospel, that whether absent or present I may hear well of you. Be not dismuyed, ye are sufferers for Christ.



ever, ' cette sérénité de l'ame qui la préserve de tout découragement dans l'adversité,' imparts to xapà too passive a character. Xapd is rather that active and operative emanation of love and thankfulness that forms the sort of spiritual

26. $\tau \nu \alpha \tau \delta \kappa \alpha \dot{v} \chi \eta \mu \alpha \kappa$ к. $\tau$. $\lambda_{\text {.] 'in }}$ order that your matter of boasting may abound in Jesus Christ in me; more specific statement of the purpose of the apostle's continuance with his converts ; the previous abstract $\epsilon$ is $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \dot{\cup} \mu \omega ิ \nu \pi \rho \circ \kappa$. $\kappa . \tau . \lambda$. being expanded into the more definite and concrete iva $\kappa . \tau, \lambda$. These words, simple as they seem, have not been always clearly understood. In the first place $\kappa$ a $\dot{v} \chi \eta \mu$ a is not the same as кaú$\chi \eta \sigma t s$; not 'gloriatio quî gloriamini,' Corn. a Lap., but 'gloriandi materies' ( 1 Cor, ix, 15 , and appy, everywhere in the N. T. (see notes on Gal. vi. 4), this 'ma-
 Chrys., or generally, their possession of the gospel (Meyer), their condition as Christians. Again, $\epsilon^{2} \nu \mathrm{X} \rho \iota \sigma \tau \hat{\varphi}$ is not to be connected, directly or indirectly, with кaú $\chi \eta \mu a$ ('l'occasion de vous glorifier d'être unis ì Christ,' Rill.) but with
 as it were, the blessed sphere in which the increase takes place, and out of which, Christianly speaking, it has no existence. Lastly ${ }^{\prime} \nu \in \epsilon^{\prime} \mu_{0}$ l is neither $=\delta t^{\prime} \dot{\epsilon} \mu 0 \hat{1}$, Hein., nor ' propter me,' Grot., nor even 'de me,' Beza, but 'in me,' Vulg., - the preposition here marking the substratum of the action, the mirror, as it. were (Zanch.), in which the whole gracious
procedure was displayed; see notes on Gal. i. 24. It is thus not to be connected with kav́x $\eta \mu a$ directly, or as in Chrys.,
 $\mu \in t \zeta \delta \nu \omega s$, nor even with $\pi \epsilon \rho!\sigma \sigma$. alone, but with the complete idea $\tau \delta$ к кav́ $\chi$. $\pi \epsilon$ $\rho i \sigma \sigma$. è $\nu \mathrm{X} \rho$. Thus the whole scems clear : the rav́ $\chi \eta \mu a$ is their condition as Christians; $\epsilon^{2} \nu X \rho$. defines the holiness and
 and substratum of the so defecated action.
$\delta \iota \dot{\alpha} \tau \hat{\eta} S$ к. $\tau . \lambda$. is to be closely connected with $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \mu \mathrm{o}$ i as defining the exact means by which the increase of matter of boasting, thus specifi-
 Passages like the present, in which different predications are grouped closely. together, will repay careful analysis. Here it will be seen $\epsilon \nu \mathrm{X} \rho$. is the mystical and generic predication of manner, $\dot{\epsilon} \nu$ of place, $\delta \iota \alpha \tau \hat{\eta} s \pi a \rho$. of special instrumentality, involving also in its substantive the predication of time ; compare notes on Ephes. i. 3, and Donalds. Gr. § 444 .
27. $\mu \delta ́ \nu \circ \nu$ ]. 'Only;' my persuasion then being as I have told you, this is the solo thing that I specially press upon you, and exact from you as indispensa-
 oủठ̇̀̀ $\partial \not a^{2} \lambda \lambda o$, Chrys. ; compare Gal. ii. 10, v. 13 , in which latter passage, as here, 'verborum tanquam agmen ab illo ducitur,' Van Heng. In this one requisition many weighty duties are involved.
то仑 $\in \dot{v} a \gamma \gamma$. тồ Xp.]. 'the gospel of Christ,' i.e. which relates to, which tells of, Christ ; tô̂ Xp. being the gen. objecti, not, as Atth. would seem to imply, sub:

## 

jecti, 'the gospel taught by Him.' In such cases the nature of the gen. is not perfectly certain, but, from the analogy supplied by partially similar use of $\epsilon \dot{v} a \gamma \gamma_{\text {., }}$ is more probably that oljecti; sce Winer, Gr. § 30, 1, p. 168, but observe that the ref. to Rom. i. 3 is of doubtful pertinence.
$\pi \circ \lambda เ \tau \in \dot{U} \in \sigma \hat{N} \epsilon$ ] 'have your conversation,' 'behave yourselves,' or more exactly, 'lead your life of (Christian) citizenship;' compare Acts xxiii. 1. It can scarcely be doubted that this word, occurring once only in St. Paul's Epistles, though examples of very similar exhortations are not wanting (Eph. iv. 1, Col. i. 10, 1 Thess. ii. 12) has been studiedly used instead of the more common $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \pi a \tau \epsilon i v$, to give force to the idea of fellow-citizenship,- not specially and peenliarly with Christ (Heinr.), but with one another in Him. - joint membership in a heavenly $\pi 0 \lambda i \tau \in \nu \mu \alpha$, comp. ch. iii. 20. Numerous examples of a similar metaphorical use of the word ('vivere, non quoad spiritum et animam, sed quoad mores,' Loesn., 'ad normam institutorum in Republicâ mores vitreque rationem componere,' Krrebs.) will be found in Wetstein in loc., Krebs, Obs. p. 245, Locsn. Obs. p. 226, and especially in Suicer, Thesaur. Vol. II. p. 799 sq.
 that, uthether having come and seen you or else remaining absent, I may hear the things concerning you.' This clause, though perfectly intelligible, is apparently somewhat inexact in structure. It would seem that àкоúow (for which Luchmann; with $\mathrm{BD}^{1}$; 10 mss . ; Basm., reads àkov́w) really performs a kind of double office ; in the one case it stands in antithesis to io $\omega$ y (per orat. variat.) ; in the second place it repeats itself (Van Heng.), or suggests some appropriate verb ( ©ủфpáv$\uparrow \uparrow \omega$, Chrys., $\gamma \nu \omega \hat{\omega}$, De Wette) immediately
before öt : in a word, quoad sensum it seems to belong to $\alpha \pi \omega \nu, q u o a d$ structuram to \%va. Atlempts have been made to defend the construction as it stands, either (a) by referring àkov́ $\sigma \omega$ zeugmatically to both clauses, ' j 'apprenne à votre sujet que,' Rill. ; or ( $\beta$ ) by understanding it to imply 'hearing from themselves,' in reference to the first clause, 'hearing from others, ' in the sccond, Meyer. This last explanation is ingenious, but is apparently precluded by the opposition be-
 which seems too distinct to have been otherwise than specially intended. There must be few, however, who do not prefor the warmhearted incuria of such a brevity of expression to restorations like
 $\pi \in \rho$ ป $\dot{\mu} \omega \bar{\nu}$, àкои́ $\omega$ őть к. т. $\lambda$., or still worse, à à̀े кal àkov́бas $\tau \grave{\alpha} \pi$. $\hat{v} \mu$. $\gamma \nu \omega \hat{\omega}$ ठ̌rь к. т. $\lambda$., as suggested by modern commentators. 夘 $\sigma \tau$ 升 $\kappa \in \tau \in$ ] 'that ye are standing;' fuller expansion and definition of $\tau \dot{d} \pi \epsilon \rho \mathfrak{\imath} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$; the explanatory clause being in structural dependence upon the principal member, according to the ordinary and simplest form of attraction; sce especially Winer, Gir. § 66.5, p. 551, where this and other forms of attraction and assimilation are perspicuously discussed. The present form of attraction is especially common after verbs of knowledge, perception, etc., e. g. Mark xii. 34, Acts iii. 10, 1 Cor. xvi. 13, 1 Thess. ii. 1, al. $\Sigma \tau \eta \kappa \kappa \in \nu$, it may be observed, is not per se, 'to stand fast,' Author. Ver., 'perstare,' Beza, but simply 'stare,' Vulg., Syriac, Goth., the ideas of readiness (compare Chrys.), persistence, etc., being imparted by the context ; compare ch. iv. 1, 1 Cor. xvi. 13, Gal. v. 1, 1 Thess. iii. 8, 2 Thess. ii. 15 .

Év $\hat{\in} \nu l \pi \nu \in \dot{v} \mu a \tau t]$ 'in one spirit ; 'in one common higher principle of our nature. The addition
$\mu \hat{\widehat{c}} \psi u \chi \hat{\imath}$ seems certainly to show that $\pi \nu \in \hat{\nu} \mu \alpha$ is here the human spirit, the higher part of our immaterial nature (sec Schubert, Gesch, der Seele, § 48, Vol. 11. p. 498), that in which the ageney of the Holy Spirit is especially seen and felt. This common unity of the spirit is, however, so obviously the effect of the inworking of the IIoly Spirit, that an indirect referenco to $\tau \delta \Pi \nu \in \hat{\nu} \mu \alpha$ (counpare Eplies. iv. 4) becomes necessarily involved. Indeed in most cases in the N. T. it may be said that in every mention of the human $\pi \nu \epsilon \hat{v} \mu \alpha$ some reference to the eternal Spirit may always be recosnnized ; sce notes on 2 Tim. i. 7, and compare Delitzsch, Bibl. Psychol. Iv. 5, p. 144 sq.
$\mu \iota \underset{Q}{\hat{q}} \psi v \chi \hat{\eta}\}$ 'with one soul striving together for the fuith of the gosjul ;' making your united efforts from the common faith from one common centre and seat of interests, affections, and energies. As the higher $\pi \nu \in \hat{v} \mu \mathrm{c}$, which gave direction was to lio one and common to them all, so was the lower $\psi u \chi$ h which obeyed those behests to be one, - one common seat of concordant affections and energies. The remark of Bengel is true and deep; 'est interdum inter sanctos naturalis aliqua antipathia: hæc vincitur ubi unitas est non solum spiritus, sed etiam animx.' On the difference between the ' $\pi \nu \in \hat{i} \mu a$ (' vis superior; agens, imperans in homine') and the $\psi u x$ t, the sphere of the will and affections, the centre of the personality, see Olshausen, Opuscula, Art. ri. p. $145 \mathrm{sq} .$, Beck, Bill. Scelenlehre, II. 12, 13, p. 30 sq.
$\sigma v \nu a n \lambda o u ̃ \nu \tau \in s$ must be united with $\mu \ell \hat{\imath} \psi \psi \chi \hat{\eta}$, thus forming a participial, and indeed psychological, parallel to $\sigma \tau$ भ́кeเע $\hat{\epsilon} \nu$. $\Pi \nu$. It is somewhat singular that the best ancient Vv. (Syr., Vulg., Clar., Eth., Copt.), with Chrys., al., agree in

construction, however, has but little to recommend it in point of grammar, and still less in point of psychology: $\mu \mathfrak{a}$ $\psi \nu \chi \hat{\eta}$ stands correctly in prominence after the semi-emphatic $\epsilon \mathcal{E} \nu \dot{\in} \nu l \pi \nu$. (comp. Jelf, (ir. § 902 ), and forms a modal ad-
 pecially significant and appropriate ; $\sigma \tau \dot{\eta}^{-}$
 force of the preposition oìv has been differently estimated; it is referred by the Greek expositors to the fellowship of the
 Chrys.) ; by Meyer and others to fellowship with St. Paul; the former scems more suitable to the context.
$\tau \hat{?} \pi\{\sigma \tau \in l]$ 'for the frith;' dat. commodi: not under the regimen of $\sigma \dot{v} \nu$, 'acljuvantes fidem,' Erasm., - an unexampled prosopopocia; nor a dat. instrum. (more precisely termed by Kriiger, a 'dynamic' dative, Sprachl. § 48 . 15), 'fide Ev.,' Calv., 'per fidem Ev.,' Ieza, - this construction having previously occurred in the case of $\mu i \hat{\alpha} \psi v \chi \hat{\eta}$. Hírtis, here, as nearly alwars in the N. T., has a subjective reference; see notes on Gal. i. 23.
28. $\pi \tau \cup \rho \delta \mu \in \nu \quad$ o $]$ 'being terrified:' $\ddot{\alpha} \pi$. $\lambda \in \gamma 6 \mu$. in N. T.; properly used in reference to scared horses (Diodor. Sic. xviI, 34, $\pi \tau v \rho \delta ́_{\mu} \in \nu 0 \iota \tau \alpha ̀ ~ \chi a \lambda \iota \nu \alpha ̀ ~ \delta t \epsilon \sigma=i ́ o \nu-$ ro), thence generally, though often with some tinge of its more special meaning,
 $\phi \omega \nu \hat{\eta} \pi \tau \nu \rho o ́ \mu \in \nu o \nu$, and lastly, as here, in a purcly general sense, e. g. [1Plato], $A x$ -
 тov ; comp. Mesych. $\pi \tau u ́ p \in \tau \alpha \iota^{\circ} \sigma \epsilon \in \in \tau \alpha l$, фоBeîtas, фpirtel, and IIypke, Obs. Vol. If. p. 312. It is not improb. derived from a root $\Pi T \Upsilon-$ - and allied with $\pi \tau 0 \epsilon \epsilon \omega$; see Benfey, Wurzellex. Vol. ir. p. 100. $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau t \kappa \in \iota \mu \epsilon 匕 \nu \omega \nu]$ 'the opposers,' 'your adversaries;' compare 1 Cor. xvi. 9, 2 Thess. ii. 4, Luke xiii. 17, xxi. 15.



Who these were is not perfectly certain． The context and general use of the word seem both to point to open and avowed enemies of Christianity ；not Judaists， but unbelieving Jews（Usteri，Lehrb．p． 332 ，comp．Acts xvii．5），or，perhaps even more probably，Gentiles ；compare Acts xvi． 19 sq．

グT IS $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau i \nu \quad \kappa . \tau . \lambda$.$] ＇the which is to them，＇$ ＇seeing it is，＇etc．；viz．，when they see， as they cannot fail to do，if they will pause to consider，that they cannot in．




 $\sigma \iota \nu$ ；Chrys．The $\delta$ örtıs，as in Eph．iii． 13 al．，has here a faint explanatory force（sce especially notes on Gal．iv．23），and is the logical relative to $\mu \bar{\eta} \pi \tau \cup \rho \dot{\partial} \mu . \kappa$ к．т．$\lambda$ ．， though grammatically connected（by at－ traction）with the predicate eै $\nu \delta \in!\xi(s$ ；see examples of this species of attraction in Winer，Grum．§ 24．3，p． 150 ；compare also § 66．5．2，p．552，and Madvig；Synt． § 98．The dative auvois is the dative incomm．or＇，of＇interest＇（Krüg．，Sprachl．
 on àm $\pi \lambda \epsilon$ éas（Hölem．），－a needlessly involved construction．The reading of Rec．aùroîs $\mu$ èv è eviv has but little criti－ cal support［ KL ；Theodoret，al．］，and is properly rejected by all the best edi－ tors．$\quad \dot{\mu} \mu \hat{\imath} \nu \delta$ è $\sigma \hat{\omega} \tau \eta \rho\{\alpha s]$ ＇but to you（an evidence）of saluation；＇ scil．of final salvation，as opposed to the preceding à à́̀лєıa；＇ipsos perdet et du－ cet in gehenuam，vos autem ducet ad salutem et gloriam，＇Corn．a Lap．；com－ pare similar antitheses，Rom．ix． 22 sq．， 1 Cor．i．18，al．，and on the force of àm $\pi \dot{-}$ $\lambda \in i \alpha$, notes on 1 Tim．vi． 9.

The present reading is somewhat doubtful： $\dot{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ is adopted by Lachm，and Tisch．
（so Meyer，Alf．）with $\mathrm{ABC}^{2} ; 4$ mss．； Clarom．，Sangerm．；Chrys．（ms．），Aug．， al．，and is plausible on account of tho possible conformation of $\dot{v \mu i ̂ \nu}$ to aủtoîs． The text is，however，strongly supported （D3EFKL［并解 C ${ }^{1} \mathrm{D}^{1} \mathrm{G} ; 73$ ］；Vulg．， Goth．，Copt．，Basm．，Жth．（Platt，Pol．）， Syr．－Phil．；Chrys．，Theod．），and has apparently the diplomatic preponderance plainly in its favor．
кal тоито к．т．入．］＇and this from God，＇comp．Eph．ii． 8 ；i．e．not merely ＇vos salutem consecuturos esse，＇Calvin， which would arbitrarily limit тоиิто to the latter member；nor even＇illud，ad－ versarios quidem perituros，vos vero sa－ lutem，＇etc．，Grot．，but，as the consola－ tory nature of the context seems to re－ quire，with reference to the whole preced－ ing（certainly not succeeding，Syr．Nth．， Clem．－Alexan．Strom．Iv．p．604，Pott．） declaration，in fact to $\dot{e} \pi\{\delta \in \iota \xi\llcorner$（Peile， De W．，Alf．）；＇et hoc sane non augu－． rium humanum est，sed divinum，＇Van Heng．，and sim．，Michaelis．Whether it be recognized or not as such，there still is this token of the issue for cither side，and it is from God；compare Wie－ sing．in loc．
29．ถ̈т 七 ย์ $\mu \hat{\iota} \nu \kappa . \tau . \lambda$ ．］Reason for the declaration immediately preceding，by an appeal to their own cases ：not ex－ actly，motives to steadfastness（De W．）； as，in the first place，the exhortation to be steadfast is implicit rather than ex－ plicit ；and，secondly，such motives would have been more naturally introduced by रáp．The apostle says，the ধ̌vóligıs к．$\tau . \lambda$ ．is verily not an＇humanum＇but a＇divinum augurium，＇because the grace given to you（observe the slightly em－ phatic position，－whatever it may be to others）is such that you are thereby ena－ bled not only to believe in Christ，but also to suffer for him ：the double favor

Tò Єis aủ Tòv $\pi \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon v ́ \epsilon l \nu$ ả̉ $\lambda \lambda a ̀$ кaì Tò ímèp aủtov̂ $\pi a ́ \sigma \chi \epsilon \iota \nu,{ }^{30}$ Tòv

 who humbled Himself unto death, and was exalted with every measure of exaltation.
you have received affords the surest proof of the essentially divine nature of the token; see Meyer in loc.


 Xptotoṽ, Chrys. The aorist is used as referring to the period when the initial grace which has since wrought in the hearts of the Philippians was first given : $\chi_{\text {api }\{\epsilon \text { cral would be too present, and in- }}$ deed prospective (comp. Krüger, Sprachl. §: 53.1 ), to suit the aetual cireumstanees; $\kappa \in \chi$ ápıoтat would express that the effects of the $\chi$ ápı $\mu \alpha$ are remaining, which, though probably really the case, less perfectly harmionizes with the language of implicd exhortation than the simple reference to what they once received, and must show that they now possess. The essential character of the tense ('quod prateriit, sed ita ut non definiatur quan late pateat id quod actum est,' Fritz. de Aor. $V i, \mathrm{p} .17 \mathrm{sq}$.) may here be easily
 is not 'in Clristi negotio,' Beza (comp. Auth.), but is logically dependent on the following $\pi \dot{\alpha} \sigma \chi \in \in \mathcal{V}$, and would have been structurally associated with it if the apostle had not paused to interpolate a clanse
 terially to heighten the assertion and and to its signifieance: èkeî $\mu \mathrm{e} \nu$ ̀̀ ò $\phi \epsilon \lambda$ र́ $\bar{\tau} \eta \mathrm{s}$
 qớv, Chrys. So expressly Syr., Eth., both of which suppress in translation the prefixed $\tau \grave{o}$ र̇тè $\rho \mathrm{X} \rho$.
 specification of the preceding $\pi \dot{\alpha} \sigma \chi \epsilon \mathcal{L}$, with a consolatory turn suggested by the

 The structure is 'ad sensum' rather
than 'ad verbum ;' the participle being constructed with the $\dot{v} \mu$ eis which is practically involved in the preceding verse, rather than with the úuiv which immediately precedes : see especially Eph. iv. 2, and notes in loc. Such relapses of the participle into the nominative are far too common to render it necessary with Bengel, Bloomf., and what is more singular,
 in a parenthesis: sec examples in Winer, Gr. §63. 2, p. 505, Jelf, Gr. § 707. The frequent, and almost idiomatic, occurrence of such anacolutha seems to be referrible to the practicully weaker force of the oblique cases of participles.
oio $\nu \in \not \subset \delta \in \tau \epsilon]$ 'such as gou saw in me,' sc. when I: was with you at Philippi; compare Acts xvi. 16 sq.: oủr eìme $\nu$,

 pression è $\begin{gathered}\text { दे }\end{gathered}$ ol the prep. marks as it were the substratum of the action; see Winer, Gr. § 48. a, p. 345, and compare notes on Gal. i. 24. There is thus no need, with Syr:, IEth., to translate the sceond év émol 'de me': as the Philippians saw the ày $\dot{y} \nu$ when he was present with them, so now they hear of it in his Epistle, in which he as it were personally speaks to them; comparo Meyer. The reading ī̄ere (Rec., Griesb.), though fairly supported ( $\left.\mathrm{B}^{2}\right)^{3} \mathrm{E}^{2}$ FGKL ; very many mss.; Theoph., ©cum.] is apparently only due to the interchange of $\epsilon i$ and $l$ (itacism); see Scrivener, Collation, etc. III, 3, p. LXIX.

Chapter II. - 1. el cis ouzu] 'If then, etc.' The oìv, which has here its reflexive rather than collcctive force, recalls the readers to the consideration of what their duty ought to be under exist-

## 

ing circumstances, with a retrospective ref. to the exhortation in ch. i. 27 ; 'revocat oủj lectorem ad rem presentem, id est, quæ nunc cum maxime agitur, codem prorsus modo, quo Latina particula igitur,' Klotz, Devar. Vol. II. p. 717., Beza's correction of the Vulg., 'igitur' for 'ergo,' is thus judicious. On the exact difference between these particles, see Ifand. Tursell. Vol. IIr. p. 187.
$\pi \alpha \rho \alpha{ }^{\prime} \kappa \lambda . \quad \in \nu \quad \mathrm{X} \rho$.] 'exhortation in Christ,' i. e. exhortation specified and characterized by being in Him as its sphere and element. This important modal adjunct defines the тapáreخそots as being essentially Christian, 'quam [qualem] dat conjunctio cum Christo,' Wahl; it was only ' in Lim' that its highest nature was realizable; compare notes on Eph. iv. 1. Пара́кл $\eta \sigma$ ts is apparently here ' exhortation' (comp. 1 Cor. i. 10, Rom. xii. 8, and Fritz. Rom. Vol. x. p. 32), not 'consolatio,' Vulg. $1 \mathrm{H}_{0}^{\circ}$ è Syriac (compare Goth., Copt.), which, though lexically tenable (sce Knapp, Script. Var. Arg. Vol. 1. p. 132 sq., and comp. notes on 1 Thess. $v .11$ ), seems here somewhat tautologous when $\pi$ apauúvitov so immediately follows.

The exact distinction between the clauses is worthy of notice : the first ( $\epsilon^{\prime} \nu \mathrm{X} \rho$.) and third ( $\Pi \nu \in \nu \dot{\mu} \mu$.), as Meyer observes, certainly point to the objective principles of Christian life, while the second ( $\alpha \mathfrak{\gamma} \dot{\pi} \pi \eta$ ) and fourth ( $\sigma \pi \lambda \alpha^{\gamma} \gamma \chi^{\nu}$. к. оiкт.) point to the subjective elements : so also Wiesing., who, however, somewhat unsatisfactorily refers the first two members to St. Paul, the last two to the Philippians. Surely the very terms of the exliortation seem to imply that all must be referred to the Philippians. It is the hopedfor, and indirectly assumed, existenco of these four elements among his converts that leads the apostle so pressingly
to beseech them to fulfil his joy: comp. Chrys., who very well illustrates the force and meaning of the appeal.
$\pi a \rho a \mu v \dot{v} \vartheta \iota \circ \nu \dot{\alpha} \gamma$.] 'comjort or consolation of love;' 'solatium caritatis,' Vulg.,
 utio in cor], Aith. and apparently Copt. ; not 'winning persuasion,' Wiesing., - a meaning which is defensible (compare Plato, Legg. x. p. 880 A, тарauvatiols ev̉$\pi \epsilon i$ inns f( $(\gamma \nu \eta \tau a t)$, but here apparently precluded by the parallelism $\sigma \pi \lambda \alpha \gamma \chi^{\nu \alpha}$ каi оікт. in the fourth clause. The gen. $\dot{\alpha} \gamma a \dot{\pi} \eta \mathrm{~s}$ is the gen. of the source or agent, 'comfort such as love supplies;' see Scheuerl. Synt. § 17, p. 126.
$\kappa \circ \iota \omega \omega$ ía $\Pi \nu$.] 'fellowship of the Spirit;' gen. objecti, communion with, participation in the gifts and influence of the Holy Spirit ; $\tau \grave{\nu} \nu \mu \in \tau O \chi \grave{\eta} \nu$ aủroû
 Theoph. on 2 Cor, xiii. 14 : so expressly Ith., ' particeps fuit in Spiritu;' comp. Chrys. The gen. at first sight might seem a gen. suljjenti as above, - a construction both lexically and grammatically defensible (compare Fritz. Rom. Vol. III. p. 81, 287), but here somewhat at variance with the prevailing use and reference of кoเv ${ }^{2}$ ía and sotv $\omega \nu$ os (comp. 1 Corin. i. 9, 2 Pet. i. 4 ) in passages of this doctrinal aspect; see Meyer on 2 Cor. xiii. 14, compare Pearson, Creed, Vol. I. p. 419 (edit. Burton), and the good sermon of Waterland, Works, Vol. V. p. 351. The Spirit here is not the human spirit, 'animorum conjunctio,' Tirin. (Pol. Syn.), De W., al., but the personal Holy Spirit, as the parallelism to the first clause, and the recurrence of the expression in 2 Cor. xiii. 14 , seem very distinctly to suggest. So Fthiop. (Polygl., but not Platt), which expressly inserts ä $\gamma$ tos'
$\epsilon \check{\zeta} \tau \iota \nu a \sigma \pi \lambda$. к. , , 入.] 'if any bowels (heart felt love) and


compassions．＇By comparing James $v$ ． 11，and especially Col．iii．12，$\sigma \pi \lambda \alpha{ }^{\prime} \gamma \chi \nu \alpha$ oikтьрцой，it would seem that there is some distinction between the two words， and that the latter is not a mere expla－ nation of the former（Zanch．）．That ad－ vanced by Tittmann（Synon．1．p．69） scems satisfactory，＇$\sigma \pi \lambda$ ．amorem vehe－ mentiorem quemcunque denotat（ $\sigma$ тop－ $\gamma \dot{\eta} \nu$ ，compare Philem．12）；оікт．miscri－ cordiam propric denotat，seu sensum do－ loris ex malis seu incommodis aliorum ；＇ compare Grot．in loc．It is somewhat singular that all the uncial MSS．includ－ ing ※，at least 50 mss ．，and several Ft． read $\epsilon \check{L}$ tis $\sigma \pi \lambda$ ．Though adopted by Tisch．（ed．7）and Lachm．，and defended by Green，Gram．p．284，it seems really to have arisen from an erroneous（para－ diplomatic）repetition of the preceding tis．The prevalence of such an appar－ ent error need not shake our faith in mere MSS．testimony（Alf．）；it rather seems to hint at the general fidelity of the tran－ scribers．They could scarcely have all made the same error；but may very probably have studiously perpetuated it on the authority of two or three more an－ cient documents．Tivà is found in Clem． Alex．Strom．Iv．p． 604 （ed．Pott．）．

2．$\pi \lambda \eta \rho \omega \sigma \alpha \tau \epsilon]$＇fulffl，＇＇make com－ plete ；＇oủk єîme $\pi о$ เท̆ $\sigma \alpha \tau \epsilon ́ ~ \mu o t, ~ \grave{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \alpha, \pi \lambda \eta-$


 The position of $\mu \dot{\partial} v$ before $\chi$ apà $\nu$ does not seem intended to convey any empha－ sis；see the long list of similar examples in Winer，Gr．§ 22．7．1，p． 140 （ed．6）． Tעa тठ aủtd к．т．入．］＇that so ye be likeminded．＇The particle＂$\nu a$ does not liere denote simple purpose（Meyer），－a forced and unsatisfactory interpretation which ignores the usage of later Greek and the analogy of the modern $\nu$ á（sce

Corpe，Gr．p． 129 sq．），－but，with a weakened force，blends the subject of the entreaty，etc．，with the purpose of mak－ ing it：so rightly Chrys．，тí Boú $\lambda \epsilon$ ；＂iva


 i． 17 ，where this and other uses of iva are briefly investigated．Van Heng．refers iva to an omitred $\tau a v i \tau \eta \nu$ ，sc．रapà $\nu \tau a u ́-$ $\tau \eta \nu$ ¿̈va $\kappa$ ．т．$\lambda .:$ this seems very unsatis－ factory． Toे aủto фpov．is rightly explained by Tittmann（Synon． p．67）as，＇eandem sententiam habere， idem sentire，velle et querere，＇while the following participial clauses，тìv aủ $\bar{\eta} \nu$ ả $\gamma$ ．Ё $\chi$ ．and $\sigma \dot{v} \nu \psi$ ．$\tau \delta$ ê $\nu \phi \rho$ ．，more nearly define its essence and characteristics． Sce Fritz．Rom．xii．16，Vol．InI．p．87， who however does not appear quite ex－ act in separating ovin廿．from tò ề $\phi \rho 0 \nu$ ．； see below． $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ aủ $\boldsymbol{\tau} \boldsymbol{\eta} \nu$ à $\gamma$. Ex．］＇having the same love ；＇closer defi－

 The true nature of such love is well de－ fined by the same able commentator as ónoíws kal $\phi i \lambda \epsilon i ̂ \nu$ kal $\phi i \lambda \epsilon i \sigma^{\sigma} \hat{\imath} a l$ ．On the nature of Christian love as delineated in St．Paul＇s Epistles，the most summary and comprehensive definition of which is in ver．4，see Usteri，Lehrb．Ir．1．4，p． 242 sq．，Reuss，Theol．Chret．Iv．19，Vol． II．p． 203 sq．$\quad \sigma \dot{\nu} \nu \psi v \chi 0$ に к．$\tau, \lambda$ ：］＇with accordant souls minding （the）one thing；＇second declining clause，
 the ancient Vv．（Syr．，Copt．，Neth．，al．）， apparently the Greek expositors，and several modern commentators regard oúv$\psi u \chi 0$ and Jo ề $\phi p$ ．as separate predi－ cations；it seems however best，with Meyer，to regard them as united，the slightly emphatic $\sigma \dot{v} \sim \psi$ ．forming a quasi－ adverbial or secondary predication to $\tau \delta$


$\hat{\varepsilon} \nu \phi \rho$. There is thus no necessity for any artfificial distinctions between тঠे aủ cò $\phi p$. and Toे ह̂̀ $\phi p$. (Tittmann Synonym. 1. p. 69), nor for the assumption of a studied tautology (comp. Chrys.) : oṽvquxou serves to illustrate the participial clause with which it is associated, while $\tau \delta$ ê $\nu \rho$. remands the reader to the $\tau \delta$ aùrd $\phi \rho$. abore, with which it is practically synonymous, and of which it is possibly a more abstract expression; compure Green, Grain. p. 201. Midulcton (Gr. Art. p. 368) following Grotius refers this latter clause to what follows: this is not satisfactory, and mars the symmetry of the sentence. On the distinction between $\sigma \dot{v} u \neq u x$ os and iobiquxos, see notes on ver. 20.
3. $\mu \eta \delta \grave{\Sigma} \bar{\varepsilon} \nu \kappa \alpha \tau \grave{\alpha} \quad$ 'p pis.] 'meditating nothing in the way of dissension, or contentoousness;' not tooôyтєs, V. Heng., Scholef. (Hints, p. 105), or still worse тоєîтe, Luth., but simply фpoyouvres, continued from the preceding verse; see Winer, Gr. §64. 2, p. 618. The prep. кat̀े primarily denotes the model or rule, and thence, as here, by a very intelligible gradation, the orcasion or circumstances in accordance with it; see notes on Tit. iii. 5, and Winer, Gram. § 49. d, p. 358. On द́pisela see notes on ch. i. 17 , and on Gul. v. 17; compare too Theophyl. in loc., who appears to have caught the true force and meaning of the word ; $\sigma \pi$ ovod ${ }^{-}$-

 $\kappa \in \nu \circ \delta \circ \xi\{a \nu]$ ' nor in the way of vainglory.' Kevo $\delta$, an ä $\pi$. $\lambda \epsilon \gamma \delta \mu$, in the N. T. (adj. Gal. v. 26) is suffieiently defined by Suidas as, $\mu a \tau a i ́ a ~ t i s ~ \pi e \rho l ~ e ́ a u t o ̂ ̀ ~ o ̛ ̉-~$ $\eta \sigma$ s ; compare Polyb. Hist. xir. 81. 9, x. 33.6. The reading is here very doultful, that adopted in the text [ABC; Vulg., Clarom., Sang., Syr. (?) Copt., Exth. (? ${ }^{2}$; Lachm., Tisch.], though not
free from suspicion, has the greatest amount of external evidence, and scems on the whole the most probable and satisfactory.
$\tau \hat{\eta} \tau a \pi \epsilon \iota \nu \circ \phi-$ $\rho \circ \sigma \dot{v} \nu \eta$ ] 'with, under the influence of (due) lowliness;' modut dative (eomp. notes on ch. i. 18), or perhaps more precisely dat. of the subjective cause, thus falling under the general head of the 'dynamic' dative, see Krüger, Sprachl. \$48.15.5. On this causal dative, which though allied to, must not be confounded with, the instrumental dat. (as apparently Mey., Alf.), sce Bernhardy, Synt. MI. 14, p. 101, sq., Scheuerl. Symt. § 22. c, p. 181, and Krüger, l. c. The article hare prefixed to the abstract $\tau a \pi \epsilon i v o \phi p$. may have its collective force (Jelf, Gr. § 448) and mark 'lowlincss' in its most abstract form, 'the virtne of lowliness' (Mey., comp. Middl. Gram. Art. p. 90), but more probably only characterizes the rameev, as that due and befitting lowliness by which each ought to be influenced : comp. Rom. xii. 10 sq., and Fritz. in loc. On тatelvoфpooívn, 'the thinking lowly of ourselves because we are so,' and its distinction from $\pi$ ppautrjs, see notes on Eph. iv. 2. Trench, Synor. § 42, and the more spiritually profound discussion of Neander, Planting, Vol. I. p. 483 sq. (Bohn). $\dot{v} \pi \in \rho \in ́ \chi \chi \circ \nu \tau a \cdot s$ £ $q \cup \tau \hat{\omega} \nu]$ 'superior to themselves;' compare Rom. xii. 10, Ephes. v. 21, 1 Pet. r. 5. The query of Calvin, how those who really and obviously exeel others in certain points can conform to this precept, is satisfactorily answered by considering the true nature of тareivoфp: The $\tau a \pi \epsilon \epsilon \nu \ell \phi \rho \omega \nu$ is one so conscious of his dependence on God, and of his own imperfections and nothingness, that his own gifts only remind him that others must have gifts also, while his sense of his own utter nothingness suggests to

5．$\gamma$ d́p］So Reç and now Tisch．（cd．i）with DEFG．JK；very many Vr．；Gr． and Lat．Ff．（Griesb．，but om．om．；Ton Ueny．，Mey．，Alf．）．The particle is omit－ ted by Lachm．with ABCN；17．37；Coptic，Arm．，Eith．；Origen，Ath．，al．，As verse 5 begins an eceleniastical lection，and as the explicative force of the dap might not have heen fully understoorl，and have led to the omission of the particle，the reading of the text seems slightly more probable．

фpoveite］So ABCDEF（iN； 3 mss ；Vule．，Clarom．，Syriac，Nith．（Pol．ant Platt）；Cyr．；Lat．Ff．（Luchm．，Aley．）．The readine of Tisch．（ed．2，T），фpoveionw， with C3KL ；nearly all mss．；Copt．，Goth．，al．；Orig．，Ath．（Rec．，Alf．），is insuffi－ ciently attested hy uncial authorities，and，on internal gromme，quite as likely to have been a correction of фpoveite（to harmonize with ô kal èv X $\rho$ ．＇I $\eta \sigma$. ．）as vicc rersiti ：compare contra，Fritz．Fritzsch．Opuse．1）． 49 mote，whose julgment，however， seems here hasty and ill－supported．We retturn，then，to the reading of Lachm．and Tisch．（ed．1）．
him that these gifts may well be supe－ rior to his own，and higher in nature and degree ：see especially Neander，Plant－ ing，Vol．r．p． 485 （Bohn）．
 looking to their own interests：＇warning against a selfish regard for themselves， following suitably on the exhortation to татetıoфpooúyn．Pride，as Müller well observes，is the most naked form of self－ ishness：see the excellent remarks on selfisliness as the essence of sin，and as specially developing itself in pride and hatred，ib．Doctr．of Sin．1．3． 1 and 2， especially Vol．I．p． 175 sq．（Clark）． Kroтeiv is here searcely different in sense from $\langle\eta \tau \in i v$, ch．ii． 21,1 Cor．x．24，33， xiii． 5 ；compare 2 Macc．iv． 5 ，$\tau \delta \sigma \dot{v} \mu$－ фєроу бкот⿳亠丷．Numerous examples of similar forms of expression will be found in Wetstein in loc．，the most pertinent of which is from a writer whose diction is said often to refleet that of St．Paul，
 $\pi о \nu \mu \dot{\varepsilon} \nu \omega \nu$, å $\lambda \lambda \alpha ̀ ~ \tau \grave{~}$ éavt $\omega \hat{\nu}$ ．The reading of Rec．，ëкалтos（with CDEKLN；al．）－ окотеìтe（with L ；al．）is rightly rejected by Lachmamn，Tisch．，and most modern commentators：it may，however，be re－ marked that in all other eases in the N．T．（Rev．vi． 11 ［Rec．］，is more than
 singular．
 also：＇a somewhint weakened form of the at versative clause，the kat perhaps point－ ing to the thought that it was natural that a man should look after his own in－ tercests ；sce Winer，Gr．§ 55．8，p． 4.41 sq1．，Fritz．Marc．exc．II．p． $788 . \quad$ On the difference between oùk－à $\lambda \lambda \alpha$ ，ou
 see the acute remarks of Klotz，Derar． Vol．11．p．9．It is，perhaps，scarcely nocessary to controvert the position of Raphel（Obs．Vol．II．p．503），that $\tau \grave{\alpha}$ téurû̀ are＇sua donc：＇such an inter－ pretation is less in harmony with the context，and would tend to make rai ap－ parar redundant．What the apostle con－ demns is not so much a reasonable re－ gard for their own interests as the selfish extribition of it；comp．Waterl．Serm．v． Vol．11．p． 503.
5．$\gamma \grave{\alpha} \rho$ has here its explanatory force， ＇verily，＇＇as the case stands，＇and serves both to illustrate and confirm the preced－ ing exhortation ；see especially notes on Gal．ii．6，where this use of $\gamma$ àp is briefly illustrated．
$\phi \rho o \nu \in \hat{i} \tau \in \epsilon \in \nu$ $\hat{v}_{\mu i} \nu \overline{\}}$＇entertain this pind in yourselves，＇ sc．＇in animis vestris，＇Van H．，not＇intra vestrum ccetum，＇a construction which

## 

scems distinctly precluded by the following $\epsilon \lambda \sum \mathrm{X} \rho$. Meyer compares the Homeric
 bined with фpoveî, Ill. xxiv. 173, Odys. xiv. 82, al.

' which was also in Christ Jesus,' sc. 'é $\phi$ -
 'cum maxime,' Van. Heng., but simply correlative, indicating the identity of the disposition that is to bo between the Philippians and Christ (Wies.) : on the insertion of kai after relative particles, and the form of comparison it indicates, see Klotz, Devar. Vol. II. p. 636. The interpretation of IIofmanu (Schriftb. Vol. 1. p. 130), according to which $\delta$ is to be
 'welches ein $\phi \rho 0 \nu \in \mathrm{i} \nu \mathrm{in}$ in ilmen selbst nicht ist, ohne auch in Christo Jesu ' (compare Gal. ii. 20), seems artificial and unsatisfactory.
6. ठ̋s] In this important, and it is to be feared much perverted passage, nearly every word has formed the subject of controversy. In no portion of Seripture is it more necessary to follow the simple and plain grammatical meaning of the words. The first question is, to what does is refer? To Christ as (a) the Aóros ár $\sigma$ apkos, Christ in his pre-incarnate state (Chrys. and majority of Ff.), or,
 usually, but not very reverently, termed the 'historical Christ' (Novation, De W., al.) ? The true answer scems, to neither exclusively, but, as the appropriately chosen antecedent ( $\mathbf{X} \rho$. ${ }^{'} \mathbf{I} \eta \sigma$.) suggests, and the profound nature of the subject requires, to $(a) \operatorname{AND}(b)$, to the $\tau \epsilon ́ \lambda \in t o s$ rids (Hyppolyt. ap. Routh, Opusc. Vol. 1. p. 73) in either form of His cternal existence ; it being left to the immediate context to define the more immediate reference ; compare Col. i. 13, 15 , and see Thomasius, Christi Person, Vol. i1. p. 136. In the present verse the ref-
erence secms plainly to (a); for as the tertium comparationis is manifestly $\tau a \pi \epsilon l^{-}$ $\nu 0 \phi f \circ \sigma \dot{\nu} \eta \eta$, so this cannot be completely evinced in the case of Christ, unless His prior state be put in clear contrast with that to which He was pleased to condescend ; compare 2 Cor. viii. 9 , where, while ' $\eta \eta \sigma$. X $\rho$. is similarly the subject, $\pi \lambda o v ́ \sigma t o s ~ \not ̀ \nu$ can scarcely admit any other reference than to Christ's pre-incarnate state ; so even Usteri, Lehrb. 11. 2. 4, p. 295. In verses \&-12 the refcrence is as obviously to : the ^ó $\begin{gathered}\text { os } \\ \alpha \\ \sigma \\ \text { apkos, }\end{gathered}$ which is the more immediate sulject of
 ver. 7 , and as the slight break in the con-
 fittingly and significantly indicates, remains so to the end of the clause. Other opinions, especially that of Origen, will be found in the admirable sermon of Waterl. (Worlis, Vol. Ir. p. 109), in which the whole passage is very clearly discussed. See also Pearson, Creed, Art. 11. Vol. I. p. 155, Bull, Prim. Trad. vr. 21, Jackson, Creed, Book virr. 1, Thomasius, Chr. Pers. Vol. Ir. p. 136 sq. Reference to the older monographs on this sulject will be found in Wolf in loc., and to the more recent in Neyer in loc.
'̇ $\nu \mu \circ \rho \phi \hat{?}$ Q $\Theta \circ \hat{v}$ vi $\pi$ d́ $\rho$.] 'subsisting in the form of God,' 'ürstandend u. s. w.,' Thomásius, l.c., scil. from all eternity, in reference to Mis pre-incarnate existence, the participlo not having so much a causal ('inasmuch as he was') as a concessive reference, 'although he was,' a sufficiently common solution of the participle ; see Donalds. Gr. § 621 . The use of $\dot{i \pi \alpha} \dot{p} \chi \omega \omega$, not $\check{\omega} \nu$, is especially noticeable. In the following words, $\mu$ opфो̀ $\Theta \in o \hat{v}$, there is but little difficulty, if we adhere simply and honestly to the true lexical meaning of $\mu \circ \rho \phi \dot{\eta}$, and properly attend to the subsequent antithesis. With respect to $\mu$ op $\phi$ र́ [probably derived from

the Sanscr．Varpas，＇form，＇comp．Ben－ fey，Wurzellex．Vol．II．p．309］，we may first observe，that it is not perfectly iden－ tical with фúves or oủ⿰ía（Chrysost．，al．， Jackson，l．c．），being in fact one of its two essential elements（see especially Aristot．de Animd，II．1），but designates ＇form．＇＇appeitance＇（IEth．），＇likeness＇ （Syr．），and may be compared with eik $\omega$ ，
 Heb．i． 3 ；compare Thomasius，l．c．，p． 137．As，however，both these allied ex－ pressions stand in connection with a ref－ erence to the cternal Sonship（Waterl． l．c．），as $\mu \circ \rho \phi \grave{\jmath}$ © $\Theta o \hat{v}$ stands in distinct and undeniable antithesis to $\mu \circ \rho ф \eta_{\nu} \delta \delta_{0}$－ $\lambda o v$（Bull，l．co），and as this latter expres－ sion is referred by the apostle himself to the assumption of human nature，so no candid man can doutht that both ante－ Nicene and post－Nicene writers were right in their deduction that $\mu \circ \rho \phi \grave{\eta} \Theta \epsilon o \hat{v}$ has reference to the divine nature，and does express as much as $\Theta \in d s$ ék $\Theta \in o u ̂$ （Hippol．Vol．II．p．29，ed．Fabr．）and viòs $\theta \in o ̂ ̂$（Dionys．－Alexan．apud．Labb． Vol．I．p．853），and hence，what is truly and essentially divine ；see esp．Waterl． Serm．v．Vol．II．p． 103 sq．
o $\dot{\cup} \chi \propto \dot{\alpha} \rho \pi a \gamma \mu \delta \nu \kappa . \tau . \lambda$.$] ＇He did not$ deem His being on an equality with God a thing to be seized on，or to grasp at．＇On this important clause we must premise the following remarks：（I）the slightly emphatic $\dot{\alpha} p \pi u \gamma \mu \delta \nu$ is the predicate，and $\tau \delta$ cival к．$\tau . \lambda_{\text {e }}$ ，the immediate object to ท่วท่าดato，see Wincr，Gr．§44．3，p． 289 ； （2）the word $\dot{\alpha} p \pi$ ．，if considered apart from the context，does not seem mercly $=$
 Cer．9），but，with the usual force of its termination（Donaldson，Cratyl．§ 253）， would seem to denote＇the act of seiz－ ing；＇compare Plut．（？）de Educ．p． 120
 （3）$\quad$ zo is used adverbially（Winer，Gr．
§ $27.3, \mathrm{p} .160$ ），そ̌ $\chi \in L \nu$ ไб $\sigma \omega s ~ \Theta \epsilon \hat{\omega}, ~ ' æ q q u a l-$ iter Dco esse，＇Thomas．，l．c，p．140，and that no stress can be laid on such an use （＇spectari tanquam Deum，＇Grot．），as the whole force of the assertion of equal－ ity lies in the use of the verb．subst．，Tठ єivai；see Pearson，Creed，Vol．ir．p．88， cll．Burton ；（4）Є̇v $\mu \circ \rho \phi \hat{\eta}$ Єєồ vimápX． and $\tau \delta \in โ \nu a t \chi \sigma a \Theta \in \hat{\omega}$ are virtually，thongh not precisely，identical．Both refer to the Divine Nature ；the former，however （perhaps with a momentary glance of thought to its $\dot{\alpha} \dot{\lambda} \lambda i ́ a)$ ，points to it in re－ spect of its form and pre－existence；the latter，with exquisite distinetion，to its state and present continuance，referring the reader，as it were，to the very moment of the $\mathfrak{\eta} \gamma \dot{n} \pi a т o$.

On these prem－ ises the translation would be，一（a）He thought the heing equal to God no act of roibery，－no usurpation of any dignity which was not His own by right of na－ ture（Jackson，Creed，yiri．1）；＇non rapinam existimavit pariari Deo，＇Tcr－ tullian，see Waterl．，l．c．，p． 107 sq．：so appy．Syr．Lisè هِ［direptio］，Vulg． ＇rapinam，＇Goth．＇vulva，＇and perhaps Copt．＇holem＇（but appy．－äpтaүa a Lev． vi．4），Authoriz．，and many of the older commentators．To this，however，tho logical consideration that a condition cannot properly．be regarded an act（com－ pare Hofmann，Schriftb．Vol．1．p．131）， and the still graver contextual considera－ tions，$-(\alpha)$ that the above－rendering of ápm．ทं $\gamma \dot{\eta} \sigma$ ．not only affords no exempli－ fication of $\mu \grave{\text { خे }} \tau \grave{\alpha}$ द̇aut $\omega$ ע $\sigma \kappa o \pi$ ．（ver．4） but really implies the rery reverse；$(\beta)$
 is thus wholly destroyed（sce below），－ present objections so serious，and appar－ ently insurmountable，that we seem jus． tified in reconsidering（2），and in assign－ ing to the rare word $\dot{\alpha} p \pi a \gamma \mu$ ds a meaning approaching that of the verbal in－Tes
(Hesiod, $O p, 320$ ) or the substant. in $-\mu \alpha$ \consider స̂є $\sigma \mu \dot{s}$, $\chi \rho \eta \sigma \mu$ ós, and permutations of $-\mu \alpha$ and $-\mu o s$, such as. $\delta i \omega \gamma \mu a$, $\delta t-$ $\omega \gamma \mu o s s]$, so that the phrase may be consid-
 (Heliod. Eth. vir. 20) and the similar


 viII. 65, and sce especially Donalds. in loc. The meaning then will be (b) He did not dcem the being on an equality with God a thing to be seized on, a state to be exclusively (so to speak) clutched at, and retained as a prize ; the expression oủ $\chi$ ápт. ทํ $\gamma$. being perhaps studiedly
 sententiam etiam graviorem redderet, et Christum de illo ne cogitasse quidem significaret,' Räbiger, in Thomas. Christ. Pers. Vol.In. p. 139 : so in effect Theod-
 some variations in detail, Van Heng., De W., Wiesing., and the majority of modern commentators, except Meyer and Alford), who adopt a quasi-active meaning (' cin Verhältniss des Beutemachens,' 'self-enrichment') but somewhat confuse the exegesis. The fuller justification of $(U)$ will appear in the following note.
7. à $\lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha}$ є́ $\alpha v \tau \partial \nu$ モ̇к $\left.\in \nu_{\text {. }}\right]$ 'but emptied Himself;' ' He retained not his equality with God, but on the contrary emptied Himself, - Himself, with slight emphasis, divine as He was in nature and prerogatives.' The real difficultics of this passage are brought into clear prominence by this adversative clause We have here two lines of interpretation, perfectly and plainly distinct. (1) If, on the one hand, we adopt ( $a$ ), the first interpretation mentioned ver. 6 , then $\dot{\text { und }}$. $p-$ $\chi \omega \nu$ will be causal, oủ $\chi \dot{\alpha} \rho \pi$. रंभ. will refer to the preceding account of Christ's greatness (Waterland, l.c., p. 110), and
¿́p $\pi$, will more nearly preserve its apparent lexical meaning, but $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha}$ will have to be regarded as equivalent to $\alpha \lambda \lambda \lambda^{\prime} \delta \partial \omega s$ (Waterl., p. 108), and the antithesis as one between whole members, not, as the context seems imperatively to demand, between conterminous clauses; ' He thought the being equal to God no usurpation; yet He emptied Himself;' so expressly Waterland, and, as far as we can infer from renderings almost perplexingly literal, Auth., and the principal ancient Vv., except Fith. (2) If, on the other hand, we adopt (b) as above; then- vimapx. will be concessive, où ${ }_{\text {áp }} \rho$. in $\gamma$. will refer to the consequent account of Christ's humiliation, preserving an exact parallelism to $\mu$ ग̀ $\tau \grave{\alpha}$ €́aut $\omega \bar{\nu}$ бкот., \&́pr. will recede further from its loxical meaning, but ả $\lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha}$ will retain its usual, proper, and logical force after the negrative clause (' aliud jam hoc esse de quo sumus 'dicturi,' Klotz, Devar. Vol. 11. 2), and the sentence will be even, continuous, and in fullest contextual harmony: 'He did not deem IIis equality to God a prize to be seized, but, etc.;' in other words, - 'He did not insist on His own eternal prerogatives, but, on the contrary, humbled Ilimself to the condition and sufferings of mortal man.' Of these two interpretations while (1) preserves more nearly the primary lexical meaning of $\dot{a} p \pi a \gamma u d{ }^{\prime}$, it so unduly expands that of $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha}$, and so completely mars tho regular antithesis (oủk- $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \alpha ́$ ), that we seem bound to adopt confidently and unhesitatingly the latter interpretation : see especially Waterland (l.c., p. 110), who while adopting (1) shows clearly that (2) is a sound and catholic interpretation : compare Middulcton, $G r$. Art. p. 370, Browno, Articles, 1. 2, p. 41, neither of whom, however, seems to have felt sufficiently the lexical difficulty connected with áp $\rho \alpha \gamma \mu \delta{ }^{\prime}$.

All

## 

arrempts to preserve both the exact meaning of $\dot{\alpha} p \pi$. and the regular grammatical equence (Meyer, and apparently Alf.), in fact to combine (1) and (2), seem hopeless: the two translations are fundumentally distinct, and most of the confused interpretations of this passage are owing to this distinction and this incompatibility not having been seen and reeognized. It is fair to add that of these attempts, the most plausible is the assumed coherence of the negative with ¿́pтаүид́⿱ ( $=$ ' non-rapinam'), but to this the form and balance of the sentence, the appearance of ou with an aorist in the first member, followed by $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha}$ with a responsive aor, in the second member, - seems, as before, to present a grammatical oljection that remains in all its fullest validity.

Lastly, it is not correct to say (De Wette) that to eiva ヶ. $\tau$. $\lambda$. must refer to something Christ did not possess : surely it is logically accurate to say, that Christ did not seize for Himself, and covet to retain a state that was then his own. Even though such phrases as $\tau \delta \nu$ ञávaтov ä $\rho \pi \alpha \gamma \mu a$ Ṅ́$\mu \in \nu 0$ (Euscb. Hist. vini. 12) may be found, would it be necessarily incorrect to say of a patriot, oủ ${ }^{\text {äpr. (or } \dot{\alpha} p \pi \text {.), }}$
 тоу?
€ $\left.a v \tau \partial \nu \nu \epsilon^{\prime} \kappa \in \in \nu \omega \sigma \in \nu\right]$
' cmptied Himself,' not metaphorically, 'humiliavit,' Etth., but according to thie simple and lexieal meaning of the word (compare Xenoph. EEcon. viir. 7, al.), 'exinanivit,' Vulg., Claroman.; 0 [inane reddidit] Syriac, 'effluere fecit,' Copt. ; compare 'us-lausida,' Goth. Of what did He cmpty Himself? Not exactly of the $\mu \circ \rho \phi \eta{ }_{\eta} \Theta \in o u ̂$ (Mey., Nlf.) unless understood in a sense different to that which it inferentially has in the preceding clause, for, as Waterl truly says,
'He had the same essential glory, the
same real dignity He ever had ' ( $\mu$ év $\omega \nu$ of रुv, є้ $\lambda \alpha \beta \in \nu$ ถे oủk रुท (Chrys.), but, as the following clause more expressly shows, of that which he had in that form (comp. Pearson, Creed, Vol. 1. p. 158), that Godlike majesty and visible glories (comp. Delitzsch, Psychol. p. 34) which He had from all eternity : $\tau \grave{\nu} \nu$ ḋ $\xi(a \nu \nu \alpha-$
 $\lambda \in \tau o$, Theodoret. The military metaphor which Krebs (Obs. p. 329) finds in
 doubtful in the highest degree.
$\mu \circ \rho \phi \dot{\eta} \nu \delta$ o $\dot{\operatorname{c}} \lambda$ ov $\lambda \alpha \beta \omega \nu$ ] 'taling, or by taling, the form of a servant;' the action of the aor. part. being synchronous with that of the finite verb (sec Bernhard., Synt. x. 9, p. 383, notes on E'ph. i. 9), and serving more fully to explain it: 'si quæris quomodo Christus seipsum exinanivit? Respondet apostolus, servi formanr accipiens,' Bull, Prim. Trad. vt. 20. The choice of the term סov́خov, as the same great writer ably observes, has no reference to any servilis conditio (' miseram sortem,' Heinr.), but is suggested only by the preceding antithesis $\mu \circ \rho \phi \hat{\eta}$ $\Theta \in o v$, and marks the relation which our Lord assumed towards God; 'ad Deum autem comparata creatura omnis servi formam habet, Deique ad obedientiam obstricta tenetur,' $i b$. § 20.
 in the lilieness of men;' modal clause subordinated to the preceding:- 'if any man doubt how Christ emptied Himself, the text will satisfy him, by taking the form of a servant ; if any still question how he took the form of a servant, he hath the apostlc's resolution by being made in the likeness of men,' Pearson, Creed, Vol. I. p. 157 (cd. Burton). The expression $\grave{\iota} \nu \delta \mu o t \omega \mu$. is very noticable; Christ though perfect man was still not



ophylact in loc., and Fritz. Rom. viii. 3, Vol. 11. p. 97. Lastly, ץivés̃au does not here imply merely 'to be born,' but, as the context requires, with a greater latitude of meaning, 'apparere,' 'in conspectum venire,' Kühner on Xenophon Mem. ini. 3. 6 (Meyer), while év is used with a quasi-local force to mark the envelope or environment; see Bernhardy, Synt. T. 7, p. 209.
8. каi $\sigma \chi$ ท́нать к. т. $\lambda$.$] 'and be-$ ing found in fushion as a man,' ctc: ; dative of reference, Winer, Gr. §31. 6, p. 193, and notes on Gal. i. 22 ; où тои̂тo

 Chrys. This clause is connected by De Wette, Meycr, Tisch. (ed. 2, 7), and others closely with what precedes, a stop
 $\nu \omega \sigma \in \nu$ being left, without any connecting particle, to commence the next clause : so also Copt., and probably Syr. and Æth. To such a punctuation there are two grave objections. On the one hand, such an abrupt separation in a group of clauses which have a close logical and historical coherence is improbable, and apparently unprecedented (the examples cited by De Wette, Gal. iii. 13, v. 25, 2 Cor. v. 21, are not in point) : on the other, as was hinted above on ver. 6 , the slight break, combined with the someWhat peculiar eúpentels harmonize admirably with the change of subject, and indicate the transition from the pre-incarnate glory to the incarnate humiliation and post-incarnate cxaltation of the Eternal Son : so it would seem, expressly, Chrys. Hom. vir. 4, init. Eipecieis is thus not for $ఓ \nu$, but,' as always, implies that Ho was found, manifested, acknowledged, to be; see notes on Gal. ii. 17, and Winer, Gram. §64. 8, p. 542 sq. On $\sigma \chi \hat{\eta} \mu \alpha$, which, as its derivation [ ${ }^{\circ} \chi \chi \omega$ ] clearly hints, is not $=\delta \mu 0\{\omega \mu \alpha$, Heinr., but de-
notes the habitus, 'outward guisc, demeanor, and manner of life' (oikétov
 $\sigma \chi$ îma фрuरavı $\sigma \tau \hat{\eta} \rho o s \quad \lambda a \beta \omega \nu$, Polyæn. Strategem. I. p. 37 [Wetst.]), and its distinction from the more 'intrinsic' and 'essential $\mu$ opф ń,' $^{\prime}$ see Journ. Class. Plil. No. vil. p. 115 sq.; compare notes on 2 Tim. iii. $5 . \quad \dot{\omega} s \not \alpha \nu$ ฟे $\rho \omega \pi$ os] 'as a man;' though a perfect man, yet not a mere man ; in $\mu$ eis $\gamma$ àp $\psi u \chi \grave{\eta}$ kal $\sigma \bar{\omega} \mu a^{*}$ ékeîvos $\Theta \epsilon o ́ s, ~ \kappa a l ~ \psi u \chi \eta ́ n, ~ к a l ~ \sigma \hat{\omega} \mu a$, Uhrys., who, however, would have expressed himself with more psychological exactness if, in both clauses for $\psi v \chi \dot{\eta}$, he had written $\pi \nu \in \hat{v} \mu a$ каl $\psi v \chi$ भ́ ; comp. Luke xxiii. 26, and Delitzsch, Bibl. Psychol. v. I, p. 283 sq.
'่ $\tau a \pi \in i \quad \nu \omega \sigma \in \nu]$ 'humbled Himself:' not éautbv étar., the emphasis resting rather on the act, than, as before (éavt. Ekév.) on the subject. 'Etareív. is clearly not synonymous with érév. (Rhcinwr.), but refers to the acts of condescension and humiliation in that human nature which He emptied Himself to assume : 'non solum, cum Deus esset, naturam assumpsit humanam, verum in eâ se vehementer humiliavit et dejecit,' Bull, Prim. Trad. vi. 21. On the meaning of тaлeเvbs [allied with $\tau a ́ \pi \eta s$, and not improbably derived from a root ミTAM'press,' 'tread,' compare Benfey, Wurzellex. Vol. 1. p. 656] in Christian writers in contradistinction to heathen (by whom it is commonly used in a bad sense, e. g. тamєเvो̀ кal ảve入єúntepos, Plato, Legg. 1V. p. 774 c.), sce Trench, Synon. § 42.
$\gamma \in \nu$ ó $\mu \in \nu$ os к. $\boldsymbol{\tau} . \lambda . \lambda_{\text {.] ' 'by becoming obedi- }}$ ent even to death;' modal clause appended to and explaining é $\tau a \pi \epsilon i \nu \omega \sigma \in \nu$; the supplementary words $\mu$ '́ $\chi \rho \iota$ к. $\tau . \lambda$. not belonging to the finite verb (Beng., Hofm. Schriftb. Vol. Mr. 1, p. 80), but, as the explanatory nature of the participial clause and the even flow of the
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sentence clearly require, - to $\gamma \in \nu \delta \mu \epsilon \nu o s$ பíńк. The íтако力 here mentioned was not that shown to His earthly parents (Zanch.), or to Jews and Romans (Grotius), but, as the following verse seems distinctly to indicate, to God; compare Matth. xxvi. 39, Rom. v. 19, Heb. v. 8. The meaning of the term cannot fairly
 ©s סoûגos, Theod., for see Rom. vi. 16, Col. iii. 22. As the derivation suggests, vinर́кoos and úmakovet involve the idea of 'dicto obtemperare ; $\pi \in\left(\hat{i} \epsilon \in \sigma_{N} a t\right.$ is rather ' monita sequi,' $\pi \in เ \stackrel{\text { appxein ' coactus obsc- }}{ }$ qui;' see Tittm. Synon. I. p. 193, and notes on Tit. iii. 1. On the apparent futility of distinctions between $\mu \epsilon \in \chi \rho!$ (here not of time but degree) and äx $\rho \rho$, see on 2 Tim. ii. 9.
Savárou ò $\sigma \tau$.] 'yea death on the cross ;' not only death, but a death of suffering, shameful and accursed : oûtos

 ovitos $\delta$ ėmápatos, Chrys. On the use of $\delta^{\prime} \mathrm{i}$ in repetition, in which however the original oppositive force may just faintly be traced ('similis notio quodam modo opponitur'), see Klotz, Devar. Vol. Ir. p. 361, Hartung, Partik. סé, 2. 7, Vol. I. p. 168 ; and on the genitive (of ' more remote relation'), see exx. in Winer, Gr. § 30. 2, p. 168.
9. $\delta \iota \delta \mathrm{k} \alpha$ l] 'On which account also;' 'in consequence of this condescension and humiliation on the part of Christ God also, ete. ;' the kal not being merely consecutive (De W., Mey.), but standing in connection with úmepú $\psi$., and serving to place in gentle contrast the consequent exaltation with the previous $\tau a \pi \epsilon$ l$\nu \omega \sigma$ st ; see Klotz, Devar. Vol. II. p. 635, and notes on ch, iv. 12. The meaning of $\delta$ so, 'quo facto' (comp. Wolf, al.), adopted only, it is to be feared, from dogmatical reasons, is distinctly untena-
ble in grammar, and by no means necessary in point of theology ; 'God,' as Bp. Andrewes says, 'not only raised Him, but, propter hoc, even "for that cause" exalted Him also to live with Him in glory for ever; Serm. r. Vol. Ir. p. 197,
 ó $\mu \alpha \kappa \alpha ́ p ı o s ~ \Pi \alpha i v \lambda o s ~ \pi a ́ v \tau \alpha ~ \lambda o l \pi \delta ̀ \nu ~ \tau \alpha ̀ ~ \tau \alpha-~$
 loc. On the humiliation of the Eternal Son see especially Jackson, Creed, viri. 1. 2, and on the nature and degree of His exaltation, Andrewes, Serm. ix. Vol. i. p. 322 sq. (A.-C. Libr.).
$\alpha \dot{v} \tau \delta \nu \dot{v} \pi \in \rho \dot{v} \psi \omega \sigma \in \nu]$ ' highlly exalted Him;' Glojeg $\underbrace{\infty}_{\Delta}$ [multum exaltavit cum] Syr.; compare Psalm
 roùs গิєoús, Dan. iv. 34. The $\mathfrak{i k} \pi \bar{\rho} \rho$ is not here temporal, nor even local, though the reference is obviously to the Ascension (Eph. iv. 10) and elevation at the right hand of God, but ethical, - ' dignitate atque imperio supra omnes,' Zanch., 'insigniter extulit,' Just. : so NEthiopic, Copt. On St. Paul's favorito use of $\dot{v} \pi \notin \rho$ and its compounds, see notes on $E_{p} /$. iii. 20. The exact nature of this exaltation is well discussed in Waterl. Serm. Ir. Vol. II. p. 112 ; it is to b'c doubted, however, whether, as Waterl. maintains, the reference is specially to Christ as Son of God, and to ' an exaltation relutive to us, by a new and real title, viz., that of redemption and salvation;' so also Jackson, Creed, xi. 3. 4, Bull, Primit. Tradit. vi. 23. The accordant opinion of these great writers claims our most serious consideration ; still as the aor. seems to point to a definite historical fact, - as in ver. 8 there is appy. almost a marked transition from the preincarnate to the incarnate Son, - as in ver. 10 this allusion seems still continued in the name 'Inoov̂, - so here tho
reference is the same ; ímepvభov̂aง̀ut $\lambda \epsilon$ '
 movovouxí, Hippolyt. Fragm. Vol. ir. p. 29 (ed. Fabr.). The exaltation is thus not merely relative but proper ; an investiture as the Son of Man, with all that full power, glory, and dominion, which as God. He never wanted; see Pearson, Creed, Vol. I. p. 190 (cd. Burt.). So, distinctly, Chrysost., Theodoret, Cyr.Alex., some of the ante-Nicene and apparently the bulk of the post-Nicene writers. For the psychological considerations dependent on this exaltation of the God-man, see Delitzsch. Bibl. Psych. v. 1, p. 287.

є่ $\chi \alpha \rho\left\{\begin{array}{c} \\ \sigma\end{array} \alpha \sigma\right]$ 'freely gave;' chap. i. 29. There is no reason whatever to depart from the simple and proper lexical meaning of the



 p. 130.
ǒ $\nu о \mu \alpha \kappa . \tau . \lambda$.] ' $a$ name the which is above every name;' a name, which, as the context shows, is not to be understood generically (comp. Eph. i. 21, Heb. i. 4), as Kúptos (Mich.), or vids $\Theta \epsilon o \hat{\imath}$, but specifically and expressly as 'Inoous, the name of His humiliation, and henceforth that of His cxaltation and glory ; a name with which now every highest attribute, grace, power, dominion, and кupıótทs (ver. 11) is eternally conjoined. There is thus no reason whatever for modifying the simple meaning of .bvoua: both here and elsewhere (MIark vi. 14, John xii. 28, Acts iii. 16, Rom. i. 5, al.) the iden of 'dignity' (Bloomf., Heinr.), is derived solely from the context; see Van Heng. in loc. The reading is somewhat doubtful. Lachm. and Mey. read rठ ơvo $\frac{1}{} \tau \delta$ к. $\tau . \lambda$., with ABC ; 17 ; Copt. [a language "which has a definite and indefinite article], Dionisius-Alex., Euscb.,

Cyr. (2), al. ; but, as the insertion can more plausibly be referred to grammatical correction than the omission to erroneous transcription,-scil. the precedence of $\tau \delta$, we retain with DEFGKL: nearly all mss. ; Orig., Ath., Chrys., al., the reading of Tiscliendorf.. On the use of the article with the defining clause to characterize more expressly the preceding anarthrous noun, see Winer, \$ 21.4, p. 126, who, however, appears to lean to the other reading.
10. \% $\nu$ a к. $\tau . \lambda . \lambda_{\text {.] 'that in the name of }}$ Jesus ; ' purpose and intent of the exaltation. ${ }^{'} \mathrm{E} \nu \tau \hat{\varphi} \dot{o} \nu \delta \mu$. is not equivalent to єis $\tau \grave{\prime}$ й $\nu \rho \mu a$ (Heinr.) as directly specifying that to which ( IEth.) the adoration is to be paid, nor yet, 'ad nomen,' Beza (compare Auth.), 'nuncupato nomine,' Grot., - a meaning of $\epsilon \nu \dot{\partial} \nu o ́ \mu$. wholly without example in the N. T., but, with the full force of the prep., denotes the spiritual sphere, the holy element as it were, in which every prayer is to be offered and every knee to bow; see Eph. v. 20 , and Harless in loc., who well remarks that $\tau \delta$ óvo $\mu \alpha$ к. $\tau, \lambda$. docs not imply simply and per se the personality ('pro personâ positum,' Est.), but that personality as revealed to and acknowlcdged by man : compare also Winer, Gr. § 48. a, p. 345. $\pi \hat{a} \nu \gamma \delta \nu v$ к. т. त.] 'every knee should bow;' єis
 flection being the external representation of worship and adoration ; sec Rom. xi. 4, xiv. 11, Eph. iii. 14 and notes in loc., Suicer, Thesaur. Vol. 1. p. 777. The. subject to whom the adoration is directed, can only be, as Meyer rightly observes, the principal subject of the context, our Lord and Master Jesus Christ. Such an adoration is not, however, as Meyer goes on to say, merely relative (comp. ver. 11, eis $\delta \delta \xi \bar{\xi} \alpha \nu \Theta \in o \hat{v}$ ), but, as tho whole aspects of the passage, its


clear contrasts, and its concluding theme, - the exaltation of the Son, - seem all plainly to indicate, positive and absolute. By no one has the distinction between the relative and absolute worship of the Son been more clearly enunciated than by Bishop Bull ; 'si absolute ut Deus spectatur.......idem plane divinus cultus quem l'atri exhibemus omnino debetur: Sin Filium intueamur relate quat Filius est, et ex Deo l'atre trahit originem; tum rursus certum est cultum et venerationem omnem quem ipsi deferimus, ad Patrem redundare,' Fid. Nic. Ix. 15, a section that for soundness of divinity and clearness of definition deserves attentive perusal: see also Waterl. Def. of Quer. xvir. xviri. Vol. II. p. 421 sq.
è $\pi$ ovpavíov к. т. $\lambda$.] 'of things in heaven, and things on earth, and things under the earth; ' 'quæ in coelis, et in terrì, et in abyssis,' Eth. (Platt) ; comp. Rev. v. 13, and for examples of a similar separation of the nom. from its dependent genitives, Winer, Gram. § 30. 2, p. 172. The three classes here mentioned are to be understood not with any ethical reference (kal oi סícalot [not кal oi $\zeta \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \in s$, as cited by Mey. and Alf.] kal oí $\dot{\mu} \mu \alpha \rho \tau \omega \lambda o i ́$, Chrys. 2), but simply and plainly, angels and archangels in heaven (comp. Eph. i. 20 , Heb. i. 4,6 ), men upon earth (compare Plato, Republ. viri. p. 548 A, [ib.) Axioch. 368 13), and the departed under the eurth ; èmovpavlous $\kappa \alpha \lambda \in \hat{i} \tau \alpha ̀ s ~ a ̀ o \rho a ́ t o u s ~$

 c:mpare Delitzsch, Bibl. Psych. vı. 3, p. 354. The last class is referred by Chrys. I, Theoph., and Cecum. to סaínoves, but, as Meyer well observes, such is by no means the locality elscwhere assigned to them by the apostle (comp. Eph. vi. 12), nor is the homage of impotence or subjugated malice (2 Pet. ii. 4, Jude 6) an
idea so suitable with the present as with the following clause. The other interpretations that have been proposed are either purely arbitrary (Christians, Jews, Heathens); or adjusted to dogmatical preconceptions ('qui in purgatorio sunt,' Est.) to which the context yields no support. It may be here briefly remarked that the reverential custom of making an outward sign of adoration at the name of Jesus (Canon 18), though certainly not directly deducible from this text, may still, as Mede admits, be derived from it 'generali et indefinitâ consequentiâ,' Epist. 71 ; see Bingham, Antiq. Vol. Ix. p. 245 sq., Andrewes, Serm. Ix: Vol. I. p. 334 sq. (A.-C. Libr.).
11. $\pi \hat{\alpha} \sigma \alpha \quad \gamma \lambda \hat{\omega} \sigma \sigma \alpha]$ 'every tongue;' not metaphorically, $\pi \alpha ́ \nu \tau \alpha, \tau \alpha ̀ ~ \epsilon ̌ ฟ ้ \nu \eta$, Theodoret, but simply and literally in accordance with, and in expansion of, the preceding concrete expression $\pi \hat{\nu} \nu$ भóvv; 'the knce is but a dumb acknowledg. ment, but a vocal confession that doth utter our mind plainly,' Andrewes, Serm. IX. Vol. II. p. 337, who, however, with his characteristic exhaustion of every possible meaning also notices the former, p. $339 . \quad \epsilon \dot{\xi} \xi \circ \rho \circ \lambda \circ \gamma \dot{\eta} \sigma \in \tau \alpha \iota]$ 'openly confess,' 'diserte confiteatur' [confitebitur], Beng.; the prep. not merely pointing to ' exitum vocis ab ore,' Van Hengel (comp. Andrewes, l. c.), but, as the occurrence of the simple verb in similar but less emphatic passages (Joln ix. 22, al.), indirectly suggests; the openness and completeness of the $\delta \mu 0-$入oria; compare Acts xix. 18, е̇६оно入o-
 Philo, Leg. Alleg. §. 26, Vol: 1.. p. 60 (ed. Mang.), Lucian, Hermot. $\$ 75$; and see Fritz. on Matth. iii. 6, p. 126, who, however, on the other hand, somewhat over-presses the force of the compound, 'Iubenter et aperte et vehementer confi-

Work out your salvation ; be peaceful and blameless, and give me cause to re-

 joice, even if I have to be offered up for you.
teri.' The student must always bear in mind the tendency of later writers to compound forms : see Thiersch, de Pent. 11. 1, p. 83. The reading is doubtful: on the one hand the fut. [ACDEFGKL; 30 mss. ; Tisch.] may be due to a change of vowels; on the other hand the subj. [B; Lachm. ex errore] is very probably a correction of the anomalous future. On the whole, it scems safer to adhere to the majority of MSS. For examples of $\begin{aligned} & v a \\ & \text { with a fut. see Winer, } G r . \S ~ 41.1 . ~\end{aligned}$ b, p. 258. Kúpıos] Predicate put forward with especial emphasis ; the contrary, as Mey. observes, is àvd́a$\epsilon \mu \alpha^{\text {'I Inooûs, }} 1$ Cor. xii. 3. This august title is not to be limited; it does not refer to a кขpıórŋ̀s merely over rational beings (Hoclem.), but assures us that not only hath Jesus Christ ' an absolute, supreme, and universal dominion over all things, as God,' but that as the Son of Man He is invested with all power in heaven and earth ; partly economical, for the completing of our redemption ; partly consequent unto the union, or due unto the obedience of His passion, Pearson, Creed, Art. II. ad fin., Vol. 1. p. 196 (ed. Burton).
 ' to the glory of God the Father,' dependent on दॄधоно入., not on 厄̈ть к. т. $\lambda$.; i.e. the object contemplated by the act of confession (Mey., De W., Wiesing.), not the subject matter of it, Andrewes (l.c.), who, however, notices both. The transl. of Vulg., 'in gloriâ' (ङth., comp. Beng.), is an untenable alteration of the more correct ' in gloriam ' [better ' ad gloriam,' see Hand, Tursell. Vol. 1II. p. 317] of the Old Latin; so correctly Syr., Copt. (?). The confession of Jesus as Lord of all redounds 'to the glory of the Father, whose Son He is ; their honor inseparable and their glory one,' Waterl. Vol.
11. p. 118: $\delta \rho a ̣ ̂ s ~ \pi a \nu r a \chi o ̂ ̂ ~ ठ ̋ \tau a \nu ~ \delta ~ Y i ̉ ̀ s ~$

 Chrys., - true and wise words that it is well to bear in mind. We now pass on to a more casy paragraph.
12. $\ddot{\mathscr{L} \tau \epsilon} \boldsymbol{\epsilon}]$ 'So then,' 'Consequently;' exhortation directly and definitely flowing, not from all the previous admonitions, ch. i. 27 sq. (De W.), but more especially from the paragraph immedi-
 тapádetrya, Theodoret. In the union of $\dot{\omega} \sigma \tau \epsilon$ with the imper. the usual force of the particle ('consecutio alicujus rei ex antecedentibus,' Klotz) is somewhat obscured, - the idea of real or logical consequence (see notes on Gal. ii. 13) merging into that of inferential exhortation; 'rem faciendam certo documento firmat,' Ellendt, Lex. Soph. Vol. II: p. 1013 : see also Klotz, Devar. Vol. II. p. 776, and for examples, Winer, Gr. § 41. 5. 1, p. 269. In such a case the correct translation in Latin is not 'igitur' (Ellendt, Lex. Soph. s. v. p. 1013), nor even perhaps 'proinde,' Beza (which according to Heindolf $=$ 'igitur cum exhortatione quadam '), but 'itaque,' Vulg., this particle being more correctly used of conclusions naturally flowing from what has preceded (nexus realis), 'igitur' of conclusions that are the result of pure ratiocination (nexus logicus) ; sce especially Hand, Tursell. Vol. III. p. 187.
$\kappa a \grave{\omega} \mathrm{\omega} s \pi \alpha \nu \tau o \tau \in \kappa . \tau . \lambda$.$] 'as ye were$ aluays obedient :' observe the latent parallelism to $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \dot{\eta} \times o o s ~ \gamma \in \nu \delta \mu$. v. 8. But to whom was the obedience shown? Not, as the context might at first sight seem to suggest, 'mihi,' Wth., Conyb., 'mihi ad salutem vos hortanti,' Beng., but, as the more plausible connection of $\mu \hat{\eta}$ ©s к. $\tau$. $\lambda_{\text {. }}$ with the last clause seems to in-

dicate，－to the tacit sulject of the $\dot{\delta} \pi \alpha-$ кoì in ver． 8 ，i．c．＇to God ；＇or what is in effect equivalent to it，＇Dei preceptis ab apostolo traditis，＇Estius：so Van Heng．，Mey．，Alf．，and among the older expositors，Crell．and perhaps Justiniani． On the later form kasús，see notes on Gal．iii． 6.
$\mu \grave{\eta} \dot{\omega} s \quad \kappa . \tau . \lambda$. ＇not as if in my presence only，but now much more in my alsence．＇These words must he connected with the succeeding imperative кarép $\gamma$ ．（Grot．，Lachm．），not with the preceding aor．$\dot{\text { in }} \boldsymbol{\eta} \kappa$ ．，－a con－ struction which would certainly seem to require où（seo Winer，C＇r．§．55．1，p．422）， and would tend to obliterate the force of $\nu u ̂ \nu$ ．The ws（though omitted by B；a few mss．；Copt．，Eth．，al．）is certainly genuine，and not to be passed over in translation．The apostle does not con－ tent himself with the simple precept，$\kappa \alpha-$ $\tau \in \rho \gamma, \mu_{i}^{\prime}{ }_{\epsilon} \nu \tau \pi a \rho$. к．$\tau_{0} \lambda_{\text {．，}}$ ，but also speci－ fies the feeling and spirit with which they were to do it ；i．e．not with the spirit of men who did it when he was present，but left it undone when he was absent，but who even in the latter case did it in a yet higher degree；see Mey．in loc．，who has well explained the force of this par－ ticle．The slight difficulty arises from two oppositions－$\pi \alpha ́ \nu \tau o \tau \epsilon-\nu \hat{v} \nu$ ，$\pi$ apou－ oía－àmovaía being blended in a single enunciation．
$\mu \in \tau \dot{\alpha} \phi b \beta o v$ к．т．入．］＇with fear and trembling，＇i．e． with anxions solicitude，with a distrust in your powers that you can ever do enough ；sce especially Eph．vi．5，and notes in loc．；compare also 1 Cor．ii． 3 ， 2 Cor．vii． 15 ，where the meaning is sub－ stantially the same．The＇fear＇is thus to be referred，not directly to God（ $\nu o ́ \mu \iota \zeta \epsilon$ $\pi \alpha \rho \in \sigma \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} a \iota \tau \grave{\nu} \Theta \epsilon \delta \nu$ ，Chrys．，Waterland， Works，Vol．v．p．683），but only indi－ rectly and inferentially；tho $\phi$ óßos arose directly from a sense of the greatness of the work and the possibility of failure ；
the tpónos was the anxions solicitude which was naturally associated with it； see Conyb．in loc．An implicd exhorta－ tion to humility（Neander，p．67），or warning against false security（Calv．），is not required by the context，and is not in accordance with what seems the regu－ lar meaning in which the present form of words is used by the apostle ；see esp． the good note of Hammond，who has well investigated the meaning of the ex－ pression ；comp．Beveridge，Serm．xvi． Vol．1．p．294，who，however，is here less precise and discriminating．
$\boldsymbol{\tau} \grave{\eta} \nu$ छ́avт $\bar{\omega} \nu \sigma \omega r \eta \rho$ ．］＇your own sal－ vation ；＇the reflexive pronoun not with－ out emphasis，hinting that now they were alone，and must act for themselves； compare Beng．Their salvation was something essentially individual，some－ thing between each man and his God． A reference to the example of Christ （＇as He obeyed so do you obey，＇Alf．） scems very doubtful；the whole exhor－ tation refers to that example，but the in－ dividual pronoun more naturally points to the words which immediately precede it．The unsatisfactory interpretation є́aut $\omega ิ \nu=\alpha \lambda \lambda \eta \dot{\eta} \lambda \omega \nu$（compare Michaelis） is fairly refuted by Van Heng．in loc．
$\left.\kappa \alpha \tau \in \rho \gamma \alpha{ }_{\kappa} \zeta \in \sigma \hat{N} \epsilon\right]$＇complete，＇＇carry out，＇＇ peragite，＇Grot．，＇perficite，perfec－ tum reddite，＇Just．2：compare Rom． vii．18，Eph．vi．13，and see notes in loc．， where the meanings of this verb are briefly noticed．The compound form does not imply the $\sigma \pi o v \delta \grave{\eta}$ or $\bar{\epsilon} \pi \mu$＇่́ $\lambda \in \epsilon a$ （Chrysost．），but the＇perseverantia＇that was to be shown，the intensive кaт⿳亠 i in－ dicating the carrying through of the eैp $\rho o \nu$ ； see Rost u．Palm，Lex．s．v．，and s．v． кaтá，Iv．Vol．I．p．1599．On the prac－ tical aspects of the doctrine，see the good sermon by Beveridge，Serm．xvr．Vol． I．p． 284 （A．－C．Library），Taylor，Life of Christ iII，13．16，Sherlock，Sermon

#  

xviri. Vol. 1. p. 311 (edit. Hughes).
13. $\Theta \in \dot{\delta} s \gamma \grave{\alpha} \rho$ к. $\tau . \lambda$.$] 'for God is$ He who effectually worlieth,' etc.: yea, work and be not disheartened, for verily God is He who worketh within you. The $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ is not argumentative in reference to a
 $\mu \in \tau \grave{\alpha} \phi \delta \beta$. каl $\tau \rho \dot{\beta} \mu о v$, Chrys., but explanatory (see notes on Gal. ii, 6), in reference to the preceding command, obviating any objection by demonstrating the vital truth on which it was based, and the great principle on which it was justifiable: 'work anxiously, work solicitously; verily ('sane pro rebus comparatis,' Klotz, Devar. Vol. II. p. 232) 'Gorl giveth you the ability;' compare Lücke on John iv. 44. The omission of the article before $\Theta \in \delta s$ is justified by $\mathrm{ABCD}^{1}$ FGK ; al., and is adopted by Lachim. and Tisch.
$\delta \quad \epsilon \nu \nu \in \rho \gamma \hat{\omega} \nu]$ ' $H e$
who worketh effectually,' $\rightarrow$ [effciens, sedulam operam navans] Syriac. The full meaning of this word, so frequently used by St. Paul, must not be obscured ; it appears in all cases to point not only to the inward nature of the working, but also to hint at the persistent and effective character of it, scil. $̇ \nu \epsilon \rho \gamma \partial \nu$ єivat, 'vim suam exercere ; ' comp. Polyb. Mist. iII. 6. 5, xVII. 14. 18, xxvir. 1.11. When then Augustine urges in opposition to the Pelagian misinterpretation, '. Dcus facit ut faciamus, probendo vires efficacissimas voluntati,' he would seem to be no less verbally exact than doctrinally accurate : compare de Grat. et Lib. Arb. 9. 16, contra Pelag. 1. 19.
It may be remarked in passing, that $\epsilon^{2} y$ ep $\boldsymbol{e}$ iv is used several times in Polybius, see Schweigh. Lex. s. v. ; there is however this distinction between his use and that of St. Paul, that by the latter it is never used in the passive (see notes on Gal. v. 6), and by the former never in
the middle ; see Fritz. Rom. vii. 5, and for a notice of its various constructions, notes on Gal. l. c., and ib. ii. 8 : see also Suicer, Thesaur. Vol. I. p. 1115.
'่ $\nu \quad \dot{v} \mu \hat{\imath} \nu]$ ' in you,' i. e. in your minds, not among you; this being alike precluded by the prevailing use of the verb (Matth. xiv. 2, 2 Cor. iv. 12, Gal. iii. 5 [sec notes], Col.i. 29, al.) and the nature of the context. $\kappa$ к人 ro Né $\lambda \in \iota \nu \quad$ к. т. $\lambda$.$] 'both to will and to do,'$ as much the one as the other. Observe especially the use of the more emphatic enumeration кal-кal; the N'É $\lambda \in \iota \nu$ no less than the eivepreiv is a direct result of the divine ėvépyєıa; see Winer, Gr. §53.4, p. 389, notes on 1 Tim. iv. 10. Of these the first ( $\tau \delta \dot{\text { ḉ }}$ ' $\epsilon \epsilon \nu$ ) is due to the inworking influence of sanctifying grace (Waterl. Serm. xxvy. Vol. v. p. 688), or, to speak more precisely, of gratia proceeniens, to which the first and feeblest motion of the better will, the first process of the better judgment ( 2 Cor. iii. 5), is alone to be ascribed ; comp. Andrewes, Serm. Vol. $\nabla$. p. 303 : the second ( $\tau \delta$
 assistance of which we strive (' non per vires nativas sed dativas') to perform the will of God; see Ebrard, Christl. Dogm. § 524, Vol. II. p. 566. The lan-

 open to exception if the $\vartheta \uparrow \lambda \hat{\eta} \sigma \eta$ s is to be referred to a 'dispositio previa;' this however cannot be certainly inferred from his context. For the diversities of opinion on this text, even among Romanists, sce the long and perspicuous note of Justiniani in loc., and for the differences among Protestants, and the necessary distinction between passivity ('homo convertitur nolens') and receptivity ('ex nolente fit volens'), see Ebrard, Christl. Dogm. § 519 - 522, Vol. II. p. 558 sq . It may be remarked that

the repetition of the word $\begin{gathered}\text { evep } \\ \text { eiv, (pre- }\end{gathered}$ served correctly by Claroman., Coptic, but not Syr., Vulg.), rather than катєp$\gamma \dot{\alpha} \zeta \epsilon \sigma \hat{c} \alpha$, is due to the fact that it cxpresses more exactly the inward ability showing itself in action, and is thus more suitable in connection with $\lambda$ cé $\lambda \epsilon i \nu$. While then this important verse is a conclusive protest against Pelagianism on the one hand, its guarded language as well as its intimate connection with ver. 12 show that it is as conclusive on the other against the Dordracene doctrines of irrevocable election (cap. 1), and all but compelling grace: cap. III. IV. 12, 16, Reject err. 8. $\dot{\jmath} \pi \grave{\epsilon} \rho$ गरीs $\epsilon$ и̇ठок.] 'of Mis good pleasure,' i.e. in fulfilment of, to carry it out and satisfy
 тô̂, Chrys. The prep. vinє่ here seems to approach in meaning кará (Eph. i. 5), or $\delta \iota a ́$ (Eph. ii. 4 ), but may still be clearly distinguished from cither. It does not represent the eúסoкia as the mere ratio of the action, or the mere norma according to which it was done, but, as the interested cause of it; the commodum of the $\epsilon \dot{u} \delta \frac{\kappa}{i} \alpha$ was that which the action was designed to subserve ; comp. Rom. xv. 8, John xi. 4, where however the primary meaning of $\hat{\pi r \epsilon} \mathrm{\rho} \rho$ is less obscured: see Winer, Gr. § 47. 1, p. 343, and compare Rost u. Palm, Lex. s. v. ப́mép, 2, Vol. II. p. 2067. Eùठoкia is referred by Syr., Just., Green (Gram. N. T. p. 302), to the 'bona voluntas' of the Philippians : this is grammatically plausible, but owing to the preceding $\uparrow \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \nu$ (Meycr) not exegetically satisfactory. Still less probable is the connection of the clause with ver. 14 (Conyb.), which, independently of grammatical difficulties (see AIford), has the whole consent of antiquity, Ff. and Vv., opposed to it. On the meaning of củठokía, see notes on Eph. i. 5; and compare Andrewes, Serm. XIII.

Vol. 1. p. 239 (A.-C. Libr.).
14. $\pi$ á $\nu \tau a]$ 'all things,' not exactly 'everything you have to do,' or with ref. to ver. 3 (Fell), but, as the context and the last of the two associated substantives seem to suggest, ' everything which stands in moro immediate connection with the foregoing commands, and in which the malice of the devil might more especially be displayed:' sce Chrysost. in loc.
$\gamma \circ \gamma \gamma v \sigma \mu \hat{\omega} \nu]$ 'murmurings ;' compare 1 Pet. iv. 5, ằ $\nu \in v$ yor $\gamma v \mu \mu 0 \hat{v}$ : here apparently against
 Chrys. ; not, against one another, Wicsinger ('placido se gerant inter homines,' Calv.), - a command which here finds no natural place. Alford urges that in every place in the N. T. (only 4, and only here by St. Paul) roy $\gamma \sigma \sigma$. refers to murmuring against men; but of these passages, one (John vii. 12) is not applicable, and another (1 Pet. iv, 9, compare De Wette) not perfectly certain. That it may be applicd to God seems demonstrable from 1 Cor. x .10 . The forms roy $\begin{aligned} & \\ & \text { sic } \text { and } \gamma \quad \gamma \gamma v \sigma \mu \text { os [per- }\end{aligned}$ haps derived from the Sanscr. guy, 'to murmur,' Benfey, Wur~ellex. Vol. ri. p. 62] are said to be Ionic, the Attic forms
 Lobeck, Pliryn. p. 358, compare Thom. M. p. 856 (cd. Bern.). On the alleged but doubtful distinction between ăveu and $\chi$ woís, sce notes on Eph. ii. 12.
$\delta \iota a \lambda \circ \gamma \iota \sigma \mu \hat{\omega} \nu]$ 'doubtings,' 'hæsitationibus,' Vulg., Fthiop. [dubitatione], Copt. [cogitationibus], - not ' detractationibus,' Clarom., or $\mathrm{e}^{\star}$ [divis: ione], a meaning not found in the N. T., and apparently not supported by any good lexical authority; see especially hotes on 1 Tim. i. 8, where this word is briefly noticed. Alford urges the use of $\delta t a \lambda o \gamma i \zeta \omega$ [read - $150 \mu a u$ ] in MIark ix. 33,

34 ；but even there the idea is＇discus－ sion，＇rather than＇dispute＇or＇conten－ tion ：＇comp．Xenoph．Merm．，III．5． 1.

15．$\nu_{\nu \alpha} \kappa . \tau_{.} \lambda$ ．］Object and aim，not ＇incitamentum＇（Van Heng．），contem－ plated in the foregoing exhortation． They were to fulfil everything connected with the great command，ver． 12 sq．， without murmurings and doubtings，that they might both outwardly evince（ $\alpha \mu \in \mu$－ $\pi \tau o \iota$ ）and be inwardly characterized by （ảkép．）rectitude and holiness，and so be－ come examples to an evil world around them．When Alford urges against the internal reference of $\delta \iota a \lambda$ ，that the object is outward，－blamelessness and good example，he suppresses the direct inter－
 $\chi \omega p l s \delta^{2}\left(a \lambda_{1}\right)$ ，and makes the apposition－ ally stated，and more indirect object，－ the good example，primary and direct． The reading is very doubtful；Lachm． reads $\bar{\eta} \tau \in$ with AD＇EIFG；Vulg．，Cla－ rom．，al．；Lat．Ff．；but the external au－ thority（ $\mathrm{BCD}^{3} \mathrm{E}^{2} \mathrm{KL}$ ；appy．all mss．； Chrys．，Theod．，Dam．，al．）combined with the greater probability of correction scems slightly preponderant in favor of the text．$\dot{\alpha} \kappa$ épatol］＇pure，＇ ＇simplices，＇Vulg．，乍th．，＇sinceres［i］，＇ Clarom．；not＇harmless，＇Auth．，Alf．， －－a meaning not recognized by the best ancient $V_{v}$ ．，and neither in harmony with the derivation and lexical meaning
 ám入ov̂s каl àmoíкı入os，Etymol．M．），nor substantiated by its use in the N．T．： see Matth．x．16，ảiépatot ẃs ai $\pi \in \rho!\sigma t \epsilon-$
 in the former of which passages it stands in a species of antithesis to $\phi p o v_{\imath} \mu 0$ ，in the latter to oo申ós ；compare Suicer， Thesaur．s．v．Vol．1．p．154，Krebs．Obs． p．331，and for the distinction between ảкє́p．，à à $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ ôs，and á̛rакоs，Tittm．Synon． 1．p． 27.
$\tau \in ́ \kappa \nu a \Theta \in o \hat{v}$

к．т．入．］＇irreproachable，unblamable，chil－ dren of God［by virtue of the vionteaía， Rom．viii．15，23］in the midst，＇etc．；not ＇irreproachable or blameless in the midst of，＇Luth．，a position which weakens the climactic force of the epithet，and ob－ scures the apparent allusion to Deit． גxxii．5，тє́к $\kappa \alpha \mu \omega \mu \eta \tau \alpha ́, \gamma \in \nu \in \alpha ̀ ~ \sigma к о \lambda t \alpha ̀ ~ к а . l ~$
 with $\mathrm{ABC} ; 2 \mathrm{mss}$ ；but an apparent al－ teration］is a $\delta$ is $\lambda \in \gamma \delta \mu$ ．in the N．T．， here and 2 Pet．iii． 14 （Lachm．，Tisch．）， compare Hom．Il．xir． 109 ；and，as de－ rivation and termination suggest，ap－ pears but little different from ${ }^{\circ} \mu \epsilon \mu \pi \tau o s$ ， except as perliaps approaching nearer to á $\mu \omega \mu о s$（Hesych．$\dot{\alpha} \mu \omega$ н́ $\mu \eta \tau о s^{\circ} \alpha \mu \omega \mu \nu s$ ），and expressing not mercly the unblamed （Xen．Ages．vi．8），but non－blamewor－ thy state of the тékva；compare æsch． Sept．508，and see Tittm．Synon．1．p． 29.

The reading $\mu$＇́ $\sigma o \nu$ （adverbially used，Winer，Gr．§ 54．6）， with ABCD1FG（Lachm．，Tisch．），has the weight of uncial authority as well as critical probability in its favor．
$\sigma \kappa o \lambda t a ̂ s k a l$ bb $\in \sigma \tau \rho$ ．］＇crooked and perverted，＇in reference to their moral obliquity and their distorted spiritual growth ；compare Deut．xxxii．5．इko－ $\lambda t o ́ s$ ，allied probably to $\sigma \kappa \in ́ \lambda o s, \sigma \kappa \in \lambda \lambda o ́ s$ ， and $\sigma \kappa a\{p \in ⿺ \nu$［Pott，Etym．Forsch．Vol． 1. p．268，root－form $\Sigma \mathrm{K}$－，＇progression by steps，＇Donalds．Cratyl．$\$ 387$ ，less prob－ ably KP－，Sanscr．kri with prefixed $\sigma$ ， Benfey，Wurzell．Vol．ir．p．363］，occurs elsewhere in the N．T．，once in a proper sense，Luke iii．5，and twice，as here，in an cthical sense，$\Lambda$ cts ii． 40 ， 1 Peter ii． 18．$\Delta l \epsilon \sigma \tau \rho$ ．is similarly found in Matth． xvii． 17 ，Lukc ix．41，Acts xx． 30 ；see also examples from Arrian in Raphel， Annot．Vol．in．p． 309.
év＇ois］＇among whom，＇－in reference to the persons of which the $\gamma \in \nu \in \dot{\alpha}$ was com－ posed；comp．Winer，Gr．§ 58．4．b，p．




457 ：so，somewhat similarly，Gal．ii． 2. $\phi \alpha[\nu \in \sigma \hat{N} \epsilon]$＇ye appear，are seen；＇not ＇lucetis，＇Vulg．，Clarom．，Wordsw．，al．， which would require the active $\phi a i \nu \in \tau \epsilon$ ， John i．5，v．35， 2 Pet．i．19，al．Alford objects that the active is not used by St ． Paul ：but will this justify a departure not only from the simple meaning of the word，but from the special use of the middle in connection with the appear－ ance or rising of heavenly bodies？see examples in Rost u．Palm，Lcx．s．v．Ir． 1．b．The verb is indicative（Vulg．， Copt．，Fth．），not imperat．（Syr．，The－ ophyl．）：Christians were not to be，but now actually were，as luminaries in a dark，heathen，world ；compare Matth． v．14，Eph．v． 8.
$\phi \omega \sigma \tau \hat{\eta} \rho \in S$＇̇ $\nu \kappa$ ќ $\sigma \mu \omega$ ］＇luminaries， heavenly lights in the world ；＇${ }^{2} \nu \kappa \kappa \delta \sigma \mu$ ．bc－ ing closely joined with $\phi \omega \sigma \tau$ ．as its secon－ dary predicate（Vulg．and all Vr．），not with фaiveave（De W．），which would thus have two prepositional adjuncts． To illustrate the meaning of $\phi \omega \sigma \tau$ ．com－ pare Rev．xxi．11，Gen．i．14，16，Ec－ clus．xliii． 7 （applied to the moon），Wis－ dom xiii．2，and for the different uses of $\kappa \delta \sigma \mu o s$ ，here apparently in its ethical sense，see notes on Gal．iv．3．The ref－ erence to the use of torches to guide pas－ sengers along the narrow and winding streets of a city（Wordsw．）is ingenious， but scarcely in harmony with $\phi$ aiv $\bar{\sigma} \boldsymbol{N} \epsilon$ ， and the tenor of the context．
 hold forth（are the ministers of）the word of life：＇further and explanatory defini－ tion of the preceding，the participle hav－ ing a slightly causal force．．The meaning of $\epsilon_{\pi} \pi \in \chi$ ．is somewhat doubtfu］．It cer－ tainly cannot be for $\pi \rho \rho \sigma \in ́ \chi \sigma \nu \tau \in s$ ，Theod．， as this would require a dat．；it may，how－
ever，be either（a）occupantes，comp．Syr．

［ut sitis illis loco salutis］，and thence， with a modification of meaning，＇conti－ nentes，＇Vulg．，Claroman．，＇tenentes，＇ Copt．（Wth．paraphrases），кatéXoyтes， Chrys．，モ́ $\chi o y \tau \epsilon s$ ，Theoph．，Ecum，－ a translation that has certainly a lexical basis（see examples in lRost u．Palm， Lex．s．v．r．b，Vol．1．p．1029）and is far too hastily condemned by Van IIeng． and Wiesing．；$(\beta)$ prcetendentes，Beza， Auth．，＇doctrinam spectandam preben－ tes，＇Van Heng．，with reference to the preceding image．Of these interpr．（a）， has clearly the weight of antiquity on its side ；still as no exactly opposite example of the modified sense＇continentes＇has yet been adduced，and as the meaning ＇occupantes＇involves an idea foreign to the N．T．（compare Meyer），we seem bound to adhere to $(\beta)$ ，a meaning that is lexically accurate and exegetically satisfactory．The objection of Meyer is fully answered by Alford in loc．
The $\lambda o ́ \gamma o s ~ \zeta \omega \hat{\eta} s$ is the gospel，$\zeta \omega \hat{s} s$ being a species of gen．of the content，$\tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ ai＇w－ $\nu ⿺ 辶 \nu \pi \rho \circ \xi \in \nu \in \mathfrak{i}\left\lceil\omega \eta \eta^{2} \nu\right.$ ，Theod．：comp．John vi．68，and notes on Eph．i． 13. кis $k \alpha \cup \dot{\chi} \chi \eta \mu \alpha]$＇to form a ground of boasting for me；＇result，on the side of St．Paul，of his converts becoming ü $\mu \epsilon \mu$－

 $\lambda a \mu \pi \rho \partial ̀ \nu \pi o t \epsilon i \nu$, Chrys．；comp． 2 Cor．i． 14．$\ldots$ ढis $\dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon \in \rho a \nu \mathrm{X} \rho$ ．］ ＇against the day of Christ；＇the preposi－ tion not so much marking the epoch to which（ $\epsilon \omega$ ），as that for which，in refer－ ence to which，the boasting was to be reserved ；compare ch．i．10，Eph．iv．30， and notes on Gal．iii．23．On the ex－


 $\sigma v \nu \chi a i p \in \tau \epsilon ́ \mu \circ$ ．
pression $\eta$ ท́ $\epsilon$ pa $\mathrm{X} \rho$ ．，see notes on ch．i． 6.
 of ministerial activity presented in two different forms of expression，the one fig－ urative，from the stadium（comp．Gal． ii．2， 2 Tim．iv．7），the other more gen－ eral，involving the notion of the toil and suffering undergone in the cause；see notes on 1 Tim．iv． 10.

For exx． of the adverbial eis kevóv，Meb．pry？ Job xxxix． 16 （comp．єis кa入óv，eis kob－ $\nu \delta \nu$ ，Bernhardy，Synt．v．11，p．221），see 2 Cor．vi．1，Gal．ii．2， 1 Thess．iii．5， and Kypke，Ols．Vol．1．p． 275.

17．え̀ $\lambda \lambda \alpha$ к．т．$\lambda$ ．］＇Howbeit，if $I$ be even poured out ；＇contrary hypothesis to that tacitly implied in the preceding verse．In no verse in this epistle is it more necessary to adhere to the exact force of the particles and the strict lexi－ cal meaning of the worls．＇A $A \lambda \alpha$ ，with its primary and proper force（＇aliud jam hoe esse de quo sumus dicturi，＇Klotz， Devar．Vol．11．p．2），has no reference to a suppressed thought（ $\circ \dot{\cup} \mathrm{K}$ ėкот．eis кє́v．，Rill．），but presents the contrary al－ ternative to that already implicitly ex－ pressed．The preceding words eis kaú－ Xnua might seem to imply the expecta－ tion，on the part of the apostle，of a liv－ ing fruition in the Christian progress（iva $\gamma \in \nu$ ，ă $\mu \in \mu \pi \tau$ ．）of his converts；the pres－ ent rerse shows the apostle＇s joy even in the supposition of his death；compare Bisping．So remote a reference as to ch． i． 26 （De W．）is wholly inconceivable； and even a contrast to an implied hope that the apostle would survive to the ${ }_{\eta}^{\mu \epsilon}{ }^{\prime} \rho \alpha \mathrm{X} \rho$ ．（Yan Heng．）improbable，as cis $\hat{\eta} \mu$ ． $\mathrm{X} \rho$ ．is only a subordinate thought to the general idea implied in cis кaú $\eta \mu \alpha$ € $\mu \mathrm{ol}$ ． єi kaimust not be confounded with ral el（Scholef．Lints，
p．106），but，in accordance with the po－ sition of the ascensive кaí，marks a more probable supposition ；the kal in the for－ mer case being referred to the consequent words（etsi or si etiam），but in the latter merely to the preceding condiiion（ctiam si）．Contrast Soph．CEd．Rex，302，$\epsilon \mathfrak{i}$ $\mathrm{kal} \mu$ خो $\beta \lambda$ émets фpoveis $\delta^{7}$ ö $\mu \omega \mathrm{s}$ ，or ib．304， єi kal $\mu \eta$ خ̀ $\kappa \lambda \hat{v} \epsilon t s$ ，with IEsch．Choeph．296，
 and see especially Herm．Tiger，No．307， from which these examples aro taken； sec also Klotz，Devar．Vol．11．p．519， Hartung，Partik．kal，3．3，Vol．I．p． 141.

Thus，then，in the pres－ ent case，the apostle in no way sceks to limit the probability of the supposition； his circumstances，though by no means without hope（ch．i．25），were still such as seemed to preclude any such limita－ tion．It may be remarked，however， that $\kappa a l \epsilon l$ is very rare in St．Paul；ap－ apparently only in 2 Cor．xiii． 4 （Rec．， Tisch．），if indeed the reading be consid－ ered genuine；comp．Gal．i． 8.
$\sigma \pi \epsilon \in \nu \delta \nu \mu \alpha t]$＇am pourred out，＇am in the act of being so，in reference to the dangers with which he was environed； comp．ch．i．20．The simple form，which must not be confounded either with é $\pi / \sigma$－ $\pi \in ́ v \delta$ ．（Ilerod．II．39，Iv．62，Plut．Popl． §4，al．），or кata⿱亠幺́ย́vס．（Plutarch Alex． § 50 ，ib．Mor．p． $435 \mathrm{~B}, \mathrm{p} .437 \mathrm{~A}$ ），both here and in 2 Tim．iv． 5 ，under the im－ age of the ritual drink－offering which accompanied the sacrifice（Numb．xv．5， xxviii．7），alludes to the pouring out of his blood（＇libor，＇－not＇immolor，＇as Vulg．，Syriac，Copt．）and the martyr＇s death by which it might bo reserved for the apostle to glorify God；sce espec－ ially notes on 2 Tim．l．co，Suicer，The saur．Vol．II．p． 993 ，and the gool note

I hope to send my unselfish son in the faith, Timothy, and to come myself.


of Wordsworth in loc. iv voía к. т. $\lambda$.] 'unto the sacrifice and (priestly) service of your faith.' The exact meaning of Эvoía is somewhat doubt-
 (comp. Conyb.), but it may be doubted whether the use of the single article does not so connect $\uparrow v \sigma$. and $\lambda \in \iota \tau$., that both may specify acts of which $\pi i \sigma \tau$. is the common object; see Mcy. in loc. As, however, సvoía in St. Paul's Epistles, and indeed throughout the N. T., appy. always means the thing sacrificed, not the action, we seem bound with Syriac, Vulg.; Copt. [? for comp. John xvi. 2], Eth., and thus fir Chrys, and Theod., to retain the simple meaning of $\mathfrak{\sim v \sigma}$. and to regard míctews as a common gen.objecti to both, standing in a species of appositional relation to the former (the faith, not the apostle [Chrys., Theod.], was the sacrif.) and of simple relation to the latter. The নuvia, then, is the sacrifice, the $\lambda \in l \tau$. the act of offering it by the apostle (Bisp.), and the object both of one and the other (in slightly different relations) the riotis of the Philippians. 'Enl will thus be, not simply temporal, ' während,' Meycr, nor simply ethical, 'propter,' or' 'in sacrificium,' Eth., but will imply 'addition,' 'accession to' (Matth. xxv. 20), and will point to the $\sigma \pi$ évó. as the concomitant act ; see esp. Arrian, Alex. vi. 19.5, $\sigma \pi \epsilon \mathfrak{i} \sigma a s$ è $\pi\} \tau \hat{\jmath}$ Nuvia, cited by Raphel in loc. ; so Van Heng. and De Wette. The local meaning is untenable, as with the Jews the libation was not poured on (Jahn, Archicol. § 378), but around the altar; sce Joseph. Antiq. HII. 9. 4, and notes on 2 Tim. iv. 5.
$\chi \alpha i \rho \omega \kappa \alpha i$ $\sigma v \nu \chi]$ 'I rejoice, and jointly rejoice with you all;' I rejoice absolutely (not $\bar{\pi} \pi$ ! т ̂ी ૭va. रaíp. Chrys.), i.e on account of my probable $\sigma \pi \epsilon ́ \nu \delta \in \sigma \hat{A} a l$, and do herein
participate in rejoicing with you all: my joy is not altered on the supposition of my death. Evvxaip is not ' congratulator;' Vulg., - a meaning which the verb apparently may have in classical (Esch. de Fals. Leg. p. 34), as well as post-classical writers (Polyb. Hist. xxix. 7. 4), -but 'simul gaudeo,' Coptic, S $\hat{\rho}$;oj [cxulto cum] Syr., 2Eth. (?), the meaning which $\sigma v \nu \chi$. alsways appears to have in the N. T., and to which the following verse offers no exegetical obstacle (Meyer, Alf.) but is rather collfirmatory.
18. Tod $\delta$ ' av̇t $\delta$ ] 'yea, on the same arcount ; ' not 'in like manner,' Scholef. Hints, p. 106, but the simple pronominal accus. after $\chi$ aipo ; compare Ǩrïger, Sprachl. §46. 5. 9. Meyer reads aùtò тоथิтo, 'hoc ipsum,' apparently by au oversight, as there is here no difference of reading. $\chi \alpha\{p \in \tau \in \kappa \alpha\}$ $\sigma v \nu \chi$.] 'rejoice and jointly rejoice;' not indic. Erasmus, but imper., as Syr. and all the best $\mathrm{Vv}_{\mathrm{v}}$. The apostle had previously said that he rejoiced not only for himself, but associated them with this joy : lest they might think that the probable martyrdom of their loyed apostle was not a subject for $\sigma v \nu \chi a i p \epsilon t \nu$, he cm phatically repeats in a reciprocal form (kal $\dot{\mu}$.) what he had implied in the preceding verse, - that they were indeed to rejoice in this scemingly mournful alternative.
19. $\left.\epsilon^{\prime} \lambda \pi!\zeta \omega \delta \epsilon^{\prime}\right]$ 'yet I hope;' the oppositive $\delta$ è suggests that the $\sigma \pi \epsilon \in \nu \delta$. above mentioned was not necessarily considered either as certain or immediate. This bope was $e^{\ell} \nu$ K $\nu \rho^{\prime}(\varphi$, it rested and was centred in Him, it arose from no extraneous fuelings or expectations, and so would
 $\sigma \in \iota \mu 0 \iota$ ó $\Theta \in \partial s$ тoûto, Chrys. ; sce notes


on Ephes. iv. 17, vi. 1.
$\dot{v} \mu \hat{\varepsilon} \nu]$ 'to you,' not ' unto you' in the sense of $\pi \rho \rho \dot{s} \dot{v} \mu \mathrm{a} s,-$ a local usage of the dative too broadly denied by Alf. (see Winer, Gr. § 31. 5, p. 192 ; compare Hartung, Cusus, p. 81 sq.), nor again the dat. commodi, De Wette, but the dative of the recipients (Mey.), falling under the general head of what is technically termed the transmissive dar. ; compare Jelf, Gro §587. $\kappa$ a $\gamma \dot{\omega}$ $\epsilon \dot{v} \psi v \chi \hat{\omega}$ ] ' $I$ also (I the sender as well as you the receivers) may be of good heart.'
 is occasionally found elsewhere, compare Poll. Onom. III. 28 : the subst. єủ $\psi v \chi^{i}$ ia (Polyb. x. 57. 2, II. 55. 4, al.) and the adv. єủษúxas (Polyb. x. 39. 2, al., Joseph. Ant. vil. 6. 2) are sufficiently common. The use of the verb in the imperative as a kind of epitaph is noticed by Rost u. Palm, Lex. s. v.; Jacobs, Anth. Pal. p. 939.
20. $\gamma \alpha ́ \rho]$ Reason for sending Timothy in preference to any one else: T $1 \mu \delta-$
 סéva ràp к. $\tau$. $\lambda$., Chrys.
$i \sigma 6 \psi v \chi 0 \nu$ ] 'like-minded,' i. e., with
 фроитi§ovта, Chrysostom; compare Syr.
 am] : so expressly Copt., Syr. Timothy is not here contrasted with others (Beza), but, in accordance with the natural and logical reference of the $\dot{\sigma} \sigma \dot{\sigma} \eta$ s to the subject of the sentence, with the apostle. On the distinction between io $\delta \psi$. 'qui codem modo est animatus,' and $\sigma v \mu \psi v$ रos, 'qui idem sentit, unanimis,' sce Tittmann, Synon. 1. p. 67. The word is an $\ddot{\alpha} \pi, \lambda \in \gamma \delta \mu$. in the N. T., but is found occasionally elscwhere, both in classical (Esch. Agam. 1479), and post-classical, Greek (Psalm liv. 13) ; comp. iбo廿úX

Eustath, on Ill. xy. p. 764.
ö $\sigma \tau$ ts] 'who; ' not 'quippe qui,' but 'ita comparatus ut,' Mey., ' of that kind, who,' Alf., with reference to the $\pi 0$ ớ $\eta$ 家
 Chrys., comp. Hartung, Casus, p. 286) ; the relative being here used (to adopt a terminology previously explained) not explicatively, but classifically, or qualitutively; see notes on Gal. iv. 24, and Kriuger, Sprachl. § 51.8 sq., where the difference between os and $\delta \sigma \sigma$ ts is briefly but satisfactorily explained.
$\gamma \nu \eta \sigma i \omega s \quad \mu \in \rho \iota \mu \nu \dot{\prime} \sigma \in \iota]$ 'will genuinely care for,' 'will have true care for;' with that genuineness of feeling which befits the relationship between the apostle and his converts ; $\gamma \nu \eta \sigma i ́ \omega s$, тout $\epsilon \sigma \tau \iota$ татрикิs ; compare 1 Tim. i. 2, and see notes in loc. Mepıuvầ is always thus used with an accusative of the object by St. Paul, - contrast Matth. vi. 25 (dat.), ch. vi. 28 , Luke x .41 (with $\pi \in \mathrm{p}_{\text {i }}$ ), ch. xii. 25 (absolutely), - and agrecably to its probable derivation and affinities, $\mu \in \rho \mu \eta$ -
 nisse,' 'anxium esse,' Benfey, Wurzellex. Vol. ir. p. 32, Donalds. Cratyl. \$410] denotes anxious thought, solicitude, 'ita curare ut solicitus sis' (comp. Luke $\mathrm{x}, 41$ ), differing in this respret from the simpler $\phi p o \nu \tau l \zeta \epsilon \iota \nu$; sce Tittm. Synon. I. p. 187. The future is not ethical, but points to the time when Timothy should come to them.
21. of $\pi \alpha \nu \tau \in S \quad \gamma \alpha ́ \rho]$ 'for all the rest (now with me);' not 'plerique,' Wolf, but 'omnes quos nunc habeo mecum,' Van Heng., the article, apparently specifying the whole number of the others with St. Paul (cuncti), to whom the single one, Timothy, is put in contrast. On this use of the art. with $\pi$ âs, sec Inrüger, Sprachl. § 50. 11. 12, compare Bernhardy, Synt. vr. 24, p. 320, and Rose,




21. 'Inбoû X $\rho \iota \sigma \tau o \hat{u}]$ So Lachmann, with ACDEFG; mss.; many Vv.; Lat. Ff. (Griesb., Scholz; Rec.inserts $\tau 0 \hat{v}$ ). The reversed order is adopted by Tïsch, with BL ; great majority of mss.; Demid., Copt., Syr. : Philox. ; many Ff. The external authority seems to preponderate decidedly in favor of the text.
in Middl. Art. p. 104 note, to whose list of examples of the art. with $\pi \hat{a} s$ (plur.), when used without a subst., this passage may be added. The attempts to explain away this declaration are very numerous, but all either arbitrary or ungrammatical : this only it seems fair to urge, that the context does necessarily imply some sort of limitation, and does apparently warrant our restricting it to all those companions of St. Paul who were available for missionary purposes, who had undertaken, and wero now falling back from the hardships of an apostle's life. Who these were, cannot be ascertained ; compare Wiesing. in loc.
$\tau \dot{\alpha} € \propto v \tau \hat{\omega} \nu]$ 'their own things,' not
 $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \phi a \lambda \epsilon i ́ a ~ \epsilon i v a l$, Chrys., followed by Theoph. and CEcum., with reference to the difficulties and perils of the journey, but generally, 'sua,' Clarom., 'temporalia commoda consectantes,' Anselm,- considering their own selfish interests, and not the glory and honor of Christ ; compare ver. 4.
 tried character ;' contrast of the character of Timothy with that of the oi $\pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \in s$.
$\Delta о к \mu \dot{\prime}$, hioc̀s [probatio] Syr., 'experimentum,' Vulg., here and Rom. v. 4, 2 Cor. ii. 9 , ix. 13 , by a very easy gradation of meaning points to the indoles spectata,' Fritz. (Rom. v. 4, Vol. I. p. 259), 'indoles,' Sith. [simply,-almost as we use 'character'], by which Timothy was distinguished, and of which
the Plilippians themsclves probably had personal experience on a former visit; comp. Acts xvi. $1-4$ with ver. 12. The use of $\delta$ oкc $\mu \eta$ in the N. T. is confined to St. Paul's Epistles; compare Reuss, Theol. Chret. Iv. 20, Vol. II. p. 229.
$\gamma \iota \nu \omega \in \kappa \in \tau \epsilon]$ 'ye know;' indicative, as Syr., Clarom., Copt., Eth., not imper., as Vulg., Corn. a Lap., - a construction almost plainly inconsistent with the following words, which seem specially designed to c::plaiis and justify the asser-

 $\dot{\omega} s \pi \alpha \tau \rho!\tau \epsilon \in \kappa \circ \nu]$ 'as a child to a father,' 'sicut patri filius,' Vulg., not 'with a father,' Syr., Auth. Ver.; such an omission of the preposition in the first member being apparently confined to poctry ; see Jelf, G’r. §650. 1, 2, Ǩrüger, Sprachl. § 68. 9. 2. Mey. and Alf. deny unrestrictedly an omission of the prep. in the first member, but see Жsch. Suppl. 313, Eurip. Hel. 872, and Jelf, Gr. § 650.2. The construction affords an example of what is termed 'oratio variata:' the apostle, feeling that 'eoov'$\lambda \epsilon \nu \sigma \in \nu$ was scarcely suitable in connection with $\pi a \tau \rho l$ and $\tau$ éк $\nu o \nu$, procceds with the comparison in a slightly changed
 struction might seem to require (Rom. xvi. 18), but ov̀v 'poí, as the nature of the relation suggested; see Winer, Gr. §63. II. 1, p. $509 . \quad \epsilon$ is ro
 the gospel,' Auth., Syr., 'in the doctrine of the gospel,' 压th., but 'in evange-

Epdphroditus, your messenger, who has been grievousiy sick, and has risked his life for me, I send back, that you may rejoice.



lium,' Vulg., i. e. to further the cause of the gospel ; the preposition' eis with its $^{\prime}$ usual force denoting the object and destination of the action; compare Luke v . 4, 2 Cor. ii. 12, and Winer, Gr. § 49. a, p. 354.
23. $\tau \circ \hat{v} \tau \circ \nu \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \quad 0\langle\hat{\nu} \nu]$ 'Him then;' the $\mu \dot{\varepsilon} \nu$ being antithetical to $\delta \dot{\epsilon}$, ver. 24, and the retrospective oűv continuing and concluding the subject of the mission of Timothy. On this force of oủv see notes on Gal. iii. 5. $\dot{\omega} s$ t̀ $\nu$ $\dot{\alpha} \phi i \delta \omega]$ 'uhensoever I shall have seen (the issue of ) ;' in effect, 'so soon as I shall have, or have scen, etc.,' Auth., öт signedly couched in terms involving more of doubt, the particle ầ being joined with the temporal $\dot{\omega} s$ to convey the complete uncertainty when the ob-jectively-possible event specified by the subjunctire will actually take place; compare Jelf, Gr. § 841 , Herm, de Partic. ${ }^{2} v$, II. 11, p. 120, and on the temporal use of $\omega$ s, see Klotz, Devar. Vol. II. p. 759. The remark of Eustathius (p. 1214,40 ) is very pertinent, őtь $\delta \epsilon ́ ~ \epsilon ่ \sigma \tau!$



 Ho would, however', have been more correct if he had said $\dot{\eta} \nu \dot{\prime}^{\prime} \kappa^{\prime} \alpha{ }^{\alpha} \nu$, see Ellendt, Lex. Sophocl. Vol. I. p. 773. In the compound form $\dot{\alpha} \phi i \delta$. the prep. is not intensive, 'see clearly' (Alf.), but local, referring, however, not to the object, but to the observer, 'prospicere,' and perhaps may further involve the idea of a .'terminus' looked to; see Jonah iv. 5 (a pertinent example), Herod. VIII. 37 ; compare $\alpha \pi 0 \hat{\tau} \epsilon \hat{a} \sigma \hat{N} \alpha$, , $\dot{\alpha} \pi о \sigma \kappa о \pi \epsilon \hat{\iota} \nu$, al., and especially Winer, de Verb. Comp. IV. p. 11. The change from the tenuis to the
aspirate (with $\mathrm{AB}^{1} \mathrm{D}^{1} \mathrm{FGN} ; 17$, Lachm., Tisch.) is ascribed by Winer ( $G r . \S 5.1$, p. 43) to the pronunciation of $i \delta \in \imath \nu$ with a digamma; comp. Acts iv. 29 (Tachm., Tisch.). $\tau \dot{\alpha} \pi \in \rho i \notin \mu \epsilon \in]$ 'the things pertaining to me;' not identical with $\tau \grave{\alpha} \kappa a \tau^{3} \epsilon \mu^{\prime} \epsilon$ (ch. i. 12), but with a faint idea of motion (occupation about, Acts xix. 25), in ref. to their issue and development; i.e. how they will turn,

 $\delta v \sigma \chi \in \rho \hat{\eta}$, Theod. The form $\epsilon^{\xi} \xi \alpha u \tau \hat{\eta} s$, sc. Tท̂s ẅpas, 'illico,' 'e vestigio' (тараuтíка, Hesych., є ย̉શtéws, Suid.), occurs in Mark vi. 25 , Acts x. 33 , al.
24. $\pi$ ย́ $\pi$ oเNे. Є̀v Kup $\mathrm{K} \omega]$ ' am confident in the Lord; 'He is the sphere of my confidence; 'seo notes on ver. 19, and on Eph. iv. 17, vi. 1.
$\kappa \alpha\} a \dot{v} \tau 6 s]$ 'I myself also;' the кal implying that besides sending Timothy to them, the apostle hoped himself to come in person. The тaxéws, as Meyer remarks, must, as in ver. 19 , date from the present time, the time of writing the Epistle. In recurring, however, to the mission of Timothy, ver. 23, he expresses the hope that it would be $\epsilon \xi \alpha u \tau \hat{\eta} s$, 'forthwith;' his own visit he had good confidence would be raxéws, i.e. no long interval after.
 deemed it necessary;' though probable, the mission of 'Timothy and the apostle's own visit were both contingent; he deemed it necessary therefore to send (back) one on whom he could rely, and in whom the Philippians had interest and confidence. Wiesinger denies any connection between the sending back Epaphr. and the mission of Timothy; this, however, is surely to overlook the antithesis suggested by $\delta \epsilon$. On the use

## Хрєías $\mu o v, \pi \epsilon ́ \mu \Psi a \iota ~ \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ i ́ \mu a ̂ s, ~$

of the epistolary aorist (still more expressly ver. 28), see Winer, Gr. \$ 40. 5, b. 2, p. 249.
$\left.{ }^{3} \mathrm{E} \pi \alpha \phi \rho \delta \delta \iota \tau 0 \nu\right]$
Of Epaphroditus, beyond this passage, nothing is known. He has been supposed to be the same with Epaphras, Col. i. 7 , iv. 12 , Philem. 23 ; but this, though etymologically possible, is certainly not historically demonstrable. As the name appears to lave been not uncommon (Sueton. Nero, § 49, Jospph. contr. Ap. 1. 1, al., see Wetst. in loc.), -as Epaphras was a Colossian (Col. iv. 12), and as the alms of the European city of Philippi would hardly have been committed to the member of a church so remote from it as the $\Lambda$ siatic Colossæ, it scems natural to regard them as different persons. For the necessarily scanty litcrature on the subject, see Winer, $R$ WB. Art. 'Epaphras,' Vol. x. p. 330.
$\tau \delta \nu \dot{\alpha} . \delta \in \lambda \phi \delta \nu \kappa . \tau . \lambda$.] Three general but climactic designations of the (spiritual) relation in which Epaphroditus stood to the apostle, under the vinculum of the common article; my brother in the faith, fellow-worker in preaching it, and fellow-soldier in maintaining and defending it; on $\sigma v \nu \sigma \tau p a r$. compare 2 Tim. ii. 3, and notes in loc.
$\dot{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ ठ' $\kappa . \tau . \lambda_{\text {.] }}$ ] 'lut your messenger and minister to my need;' secular and administrative relation in which Epaph. stood to the Philippians. 'A $\pi \delta \sigma \tau 0 \lambda o \nu$ is here used in its simple etymological scuse, not ' apostolum,' Vulg., Clarom.,
 Theod., Chrys. 2 (comp. Taylor, Episc. § 4. 3), but, as the context seems to requirc, 'legatuin,' Beza, Beng.; comp. 2 Cor. viii. 3, and see notes on Gal. i. 1. \eitoupgov (Rom. xiii. 6, xv. 16) is used in its general and wider sense of ' minister' in ref. to the office undertaken by
 $\mu i \sigma \alpha \nu \tau \alpha$ хр $\eta \mu \alpha \tau \alpha$, Theod. On the vari-

ous meanings of $\lambda_{\epsilon}$ r. see Suicer, The saur. s. v. Vol. II. p. $222 . \quad$ The connection is not perfectly certain, but on the whole it scems most natural to connect $\dot{v} \mu \bar{\omega} \nu$ with this as well as with the preceding subst., comp. ver. 30 : so Scholef. Hints, p. 106 ; contr. Do Wette (comp. Ath.), who, however, urges no satisfactory reason for the separation.
$\pi \epsilon ́ \mu \psi \alpha$, ] It was really $\dot{\alpha} \nu a \pi \epsilon ́ \mu \psi \alpha \iota$, comp. ch. iv. 18: if, however, as dues not seem improbable, Epaphr. was sent to stay some little time with the apostle (Beng.), the simple form hecomes more appropriate : comp. ver. 28, 30.
26. Ė $\pi \in I \delta$ ウ̀ $\kappa . \tau . \lambda$.] Reason for the ávaүкаîo $\dot{\text { r. } \gamma \eta \sigma \alpha ́ \mu \eta \nu . ~ T h e ~ c o n j u n c t i o n ~}$ '่ $\pi \epsilon เ \delta \frac{\eta}{\prime}$, 'quoniam' [quom jam], 'sintemal,' 'since'(sith-then-ce, comp. Tooke, Div. of Purl. 1. 8, Vol. x. p. 253), riffers thus, and thus only, from e่ $\pi \in\{$, that it also involves the quasi-temporal reference ('affirmatio rerum eventu petita,' Kilotz) which is supplied to it by $\delta \dot{\eta}$, and thus expresses a thing that at once ensues temporally or causally) on tho occurrence or realization of another; see Klotz, Devar. Vol. Ir. p. 548, Hartung, Partil. 8t, 3. 3, Vol. I. p. 259. It is not of frequent occurrence in the N . T. ; in St. Paul only, 1 Cor.' i. 21, 22, xiv.'16, xv. $21 . \quad \bar{\epsilon} \pi \iota \pi 0 \hat{\omega} \hat{\omega} \nu \hat{\lambda} \nu]$ 'he was longing after you all.' On this use of pres. part. with the auxiliary verb, to denote the duration of a state (less commonly in ref. to an action), see Winer, Gram. § 45. 5, p. 311, and notes on Gal. i. 23. The construction is occasionally found in classical Greek (sce examples in Wincr, l.c., and Jelf, Gir. § 375.4 ), but commonly with the limitation that the part. expresses some property inherent in the subject. On the (directive) foree of $\dot{\epsilon} \pi l \cdot \mathrm{in} \dot{\epsilon} \pi \pi \pi 0.9$., see notes on 2 Tin. i. 4.
$\dot{\alpha} \delta \eta \mu o \nu \bar{\omega} \nu]$
'in heaviness;' see Mattl. xxvi. 27, $\lambda v$ -




 $\beta \epsilon i \sigma \approx จ a l$ кal $\grave{\alpha} \delta \eta \mu$ ．This somewhat pe－ culiar verb is explained by Buttmann （Lexil．§ 6．13）as properly denoting ＇great perplexity（Etym．M．à $\lambda$ v́euv kal
 leading to trouble and distress of mind，＇ and is to be referred not to a root $\dot{\alpha} \delta \delta^{\prime} \omega$ （Wiesing．），but，as Buttmann plausibly shows，to $\dot{\alpha}$ ，$\delta \hat{\eta} \mu o s$ ；comp．$\dot{\alpha} \delta \eta \mu \in i \nu$ ，and see Symm．，Eccles．vii．16，where the LXX．have éкллayñs．How the Phi－ lippians heard of this，and why Epaphr． was especially so grieved，is not ex－ plained．

27．кai $\gamma$ à $\rho$ ウ̀のヘ．］＇For he really was sick；＇the report you heard was true． In this formula the ral is not otiose，but either with its conjunctive force（comp． notes on ch．iv．12）annexes slarply and closely the causal member，＇etenim＇ （comp．Soph．Antig．330），or with its ascensive force throws stress on the pred－ ication，＇nam etiam，＇as here ；see Klotz， Devar．Vol．II．p．642，Hartung，Partit． кaí，3．1，Vol．I．p．138．The remark of Hartung seems perfectly just that there is no inner and mutually modifying con－ nection between the two particles（con－ trast kal $\delta$＇́，notes on 1 Tim．iii．10），but that their constant association is really due to the early position which $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ regu－ larly assumes in the sentence．
$\left.\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \pi \lambda \dot{n} \sigma \iota \frac{\nu}{\sim} \sim \alpha \nu \alpha \dot{\tau} \omega\right]$＇like unto death．＇There is here neither solecism （Van Heng．）nor brachyology（De W．）． חaparл．is the adverbial neuter（Polyb． III．33．17，with dat．；IV．40．10，abso－ Iutely；comp．Herod．Iv．99），and like the more usual form $\pi a p a \pi \lambda \eta \sigma$ í $\omega$（Plato， Phecdr．p． 255 E）is associated with the regular dative of＇likenesj or similarity ；＇
see Krüger，Sprachl．§ 48．13．8，Jelf，Grr． § $59.1,2$ ，and the numerous cxx．in Rost u．Palm，Lex．s．v．The gen．is rare； compare Plato，Sop／h． 217 b，Polyb．Hist． x．23．6．The meaning is thus in effect the same as $\mu$ é $\chi \rho\llcorner$ Ǹavá
 Hippocr．Epid．r．（cited by Wetst．），but the mode of expression is different．
$\lambda \cup ́ \pi \eta \nu$＇̇ $\pi$ l $\lambda u ́ \pi \eta \nu$ ］＇sorrow coming upon sorrow；＇$\lambda \dot{\pi} \pi \eta$ arising from the death of Epaphr．in addition to the $\lambda u ́ \pi \eta$ of my own captivity，Bisp．；not as

 Meyer justly observes，this would be clearly inconsistent with ả $\lambda v \pi \delta ́ \tau \in \rho o s, v e r$ ． 28．If the second $\lambda \dot{\prime} \pi \eta$ had arisen from the siclness of Epaphr．it would have ccased when he was well enough to be sent away，and the apostle in that re－ spect would have been not compara－ tively，but positively，ä $\lambda u \pi$ os．The read－ ing of the text is supported by ABCDF FGL；major．of mss．（Lach．，Tisch．），and differs only from the more usual èmi $\lambda u ́ \pi ?$ （Rec．with K ；Chrys．，Theod．）in imply－ ing motion in the accumulation ；comp． Psalm lxviii．27，Isaiah xxviii．10，Ezcli． vii． 26.
$\sigma \chi \hat{\omega}]$ The subjunc－ tive is here appropriately used after the proterite to mark the abiding character the sorrow would have assumied；see Winer，Gram．§41．1，p．257，and espe－ cially Klotz，Devar．Vol．II．p．618．This remark，however，must be applied with great caution in the N．T．where，in com－ mon with later writers，the use of the op－ tative is so noticeably on the decline； sce notes on Gal．iii． 19.

28．$\sigma \pi$ ov $\delta a \iota 0 \tau \epsilon ́ \rho \omega s$ ］＇more diľ gently than I should have done if ye hark

## 

 Tisch. omits $\tau o \hat{v} \mathrm{X} \rho$, only with C, -certainly insufficient authority.
тараßo入єvod́ $\mu \in \nu 0 s]$ The reading is doubtful. liec. and Tisch. read $\pi \alpha p a \beta o u \lambda \in v-$ $\sigma \alpha \mu \in \operatorname{los}$ with CKL ; most mss.; Chrys., Theod., al. ; the meaning of which would be 'quum male consuluisset;' comp. Copt., 'paraboulensthe' [cited by Tisch. anct Alf. for the other reading]; Syr. i- º $^{8}$ [sprevit], Goth. 'ufarmumnonds' [obluris. cens], all of which seem in faror of $\pi \alpha \rho a \beta o u \lambda$. On the contrary, the furm $\pi a \rho a \beta o \lambda$. is adopted by Gricsb., Lachm., and most modern enlitors with ABDEFG ; Clarom., Vulg., Aug., Fth. (both), al.; and Lat. Ff., -and rightly, the weight of authority and appy. unique use of the word being in manifest favor of the text.
not heard, and been disquieted by the tidings of his sickness.' In examples of this nature, which are common both to the N. T. and classical Greek, the comp. is not used for the positive, but is to be cxplained from the context ; comp. 1 Tim. iii. 14 (notes), 2 Tim. i. 17 (notes), and see Winer, Gr. § 35. 4, p. 217.
$\pi \alpha \lambda t \nu$ may be connected with $i \delta \delta \nu \tau \in s$ (Beza, Auth.), but is more naturally referred to $\chi$ арशิтє (Vulg., Luth.), it being the habit of St. Paul to place $\pi \dot{\alpha} \lambda ı \nu$ before the verb, wherever the structure of the sentence will permit ; contrast 2 Cor. x. 7, Gal. iv. 9, v. 3. The same order is regularly adopted by St. Matthew ; but St. Mark and St. John, who use the word very frequently, place it nearly as often after, as before, the verb with which it is associated ; compare the extremely useful work, Gcrsdorf, Beitrage, p. 491 sq. $\dot{\alpha} \lambda v \pi \delta \delta \tau \in \circ s$ ]'less surrowful:' the joy felt by the Philippians will mitigate the sorrow (in his confinement) of the sympathizing apostle;
 The word $\dot{\alpha} \lambda u \pi$. is an $\tilde{\alpha} \pi$. $\lambda \in \gamma \delta \mu$. in the N. T. ; in classical writers it is occasionally found in a transitive sense ; comp. kidutos oivos', Athen. I. 29.
 him then;' in accordance with my intention in sending him (iva к. $\tau, \lambda$.). The oũy hero perhaps slightly differs in mean-
ing from the one immediately preceding. In ver. 28 it is slightly more inferential; here it relapses to its perhaps more usual meaning of 'continuation and retrospect,' Donalds. Gr. §604. On the two uses of oủy (the collective and reflexive), see Klotz, Devar: Vol. 11. p. 717, compared with Hartung, Partik. Vol. II. p. 9 sq., and on its varicties of translation, Rev. Transl. of St. John, p. x.
$\vec{\epsilon} \nu \mathrm{K} v \rho[\omega]$ 'in the Lord,' almost, 'in a truly Christian mode of reception,' Christ was to be, as it were, the element in which the action was to be performed; compare notes on ver. 19 and 24 , and the caution in notes on Eph. iv. 1.
$\pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \sigma \eta s \chi a \rho \hat{\alpha} s$ ] 'all joy,' 'every form of it,' not 'summa lætitia,' De Wette (on James i. 2) ; see notes on ch. i. 20, on Eph. i. 8, and compare 1 Pet. ii. 1, where this extensive force of $\pi \bar{a} s$ seems mado clearly apparent by the plural forms of the associated abstract accusatives. Toن̀s toıoút. к. т. $\lambda$.] 'and such hold in honor ;' 'such,' scil. as Epaphroditus, who is the sort of specimen of the class. On the use of the art. with roooutos to denote a known individual or a whole class of such, seo Kühner on Xenoph. Mem. 1. 5. 2, and notes on
 though not without parallel in classical
 p. 64 D ), $\pi o t \in \hat{\nu}$, al., is moro usually ex-


 rias．
pressed with the adverb，e．g．दे èv $\mu \bar{\omega} \mathrm{s}$
 p． 528 в，viII．p． 548 A．
30．$\delta$ はà $\tau$ ठे є́pyov $\tau$ oû $\mathrm{X} p$ ．］＇on account of the worlo of Clurist．＇All the Greek commentators refer these and the following words to the danger arising from persecution confronted by Epaphr． at Rome in his endeavor to minister to

 ouavac，Chrys．The foregoing mention， however，of his sickness，and the subse－ quent statement of the object contem－
 duct，seem to restriet the reference sim－ ply to the service undertaken，and ren－ dered by，Epaphroditus to the apostle， the performance of which exposed him to the danger of an all but mortal siek－ ness．Tঠे ĕ $\rho$ pov $\tau 0 \hat{v} \mathrm{X} \rho$ ．is thus not $\tau \grave{\delta}$ ejury．Baumg．－Crus．（compare Rill．）， but the service which，by being rendered immediately to the aposte，became im－ mediately rendered to Christ．
$\mu$ é $\chi$ pı ìavá $\tau 0 v$ ］＇up to death；＇ex－ tent of the danger；compare Jub xxxii．

 still moré expressly， 4 Macc．7，$\mu$ éxpt సavátou tàs ßaod́vous．intouetvávтas，and Polywen．Strategem．p． 666 （Wetstein）， $\mu$ é $\chi \rho \iota$ जैavárov $\mu a \chi o i ̂ \nu \tau a t$ ．On the force of $\mu$ é $\chi \rho \iota$ and ${ }^{2} \chi \rho \ell$ ，sec notes on 2 Tim．ii． 9．$\quad \pi \alpha \rho \alpha \beta \circ \lambda . \tau \hat{\eta} \psi v \chi \hat{n}]$ ＇having risked，hazarded his life（sout）；＇ ＇tradens，＇Vulgate ；＇parabolatus de，＇ Clarom．；＇tradidit，＇正th．The form and meaning of this word has been well investigated by Meyer．It would appear to have been formed from the adj，$\pi$ a－ páßoxos，＇venturesome＇（ptrontuסuvos кal

тара́ß．，Diod．Sic．xix．3），like тертереч́－
 to belong to a class of words in－tíw rightly branded by Lobeck as＇longe maxima pars invecticia，＇and designed to cxpress the meaning of the adj．and aux－ iliary ；sce Lobeck，Phryn．p．67，591， and Winer，Gram．§ 16．1，p．85．The meaning will then be $\pi a p a ́ \beta o \lambda o s ~ e i v a u t, ~$ and thus really but little different，in meaning from rapaßou入．，－at any rate as the latter is explained by Theophyl．，

 Lobeck，Plryn．p．238．The figurative reference to the stakie（ $\pi \alpha \rho a \beta \sigma \lambda i o v$ or $\pi \alpha-$ $\rho \dot{a} \beta o \lambda o \nu$ ）which the appcllant deposited， and if lost forfeited（Wordsworth），is scarcely so probable as the simpler ex－ planation adopted above．The dative $\psi u x \hat{n}$ is the dative＇of reference，＇and with the true limiting character of that case expresses the sphere to which the aetion is confined；see notes on Gal．i． 20，and Winer，Gr．§ 31．6，p．193．On the relation of the $\left.\psi u x^{i}\right\rangle$ to animal life， and its intimate connection with the blood，see esp．Delitzsch，Bill．Psychol． iv．11，p． 195 sq．，Beck，Bill．Seelenl．r． 2，p．4．$\dot{\alpha} \nu a \pi \lambda n \rho \omega \sigma \eta$ ］＇fill up，＇＇supply；＇compare Col．i． 24 （àv $\boldsymbol{\text { a }}$－ vari．），and 1 Cor．xvi．17．The pri－ mary and proper meaning of this com－ pound verb is＇cxplere，＇，＇totum implere＇ （ 1 Thess．ii．16），and thence by an ensy gradation of meaning，＇supplere，＇the àvà denoting the addition，or rather making up，of what is lacking；comp．

 merely syrionymous with $\pi \lambda \eta p o i ̂ v$ ，but has regularly a reference more or less

Rejoice, brethren ; beware of Judaizers who trust in the flesh. I have every cause to trust therein, but value nought save Christ, His righteousness, and the power of His resurrection.
distinct to a partial rather than an entire racuum. Such examples as Thucyd Ir. 28 (denuo), belong to another use of the prep. ; see especially Winer, de Verb. Comp. Inr. p. 11 sq., and notes on Gal. vi. 2. $\tau \delta \dot{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu \hat{v} \sigma \tau . \kappa . \tau . \lambda$.] 'your lack, i. e. that which you lacked, in your service to me;' $\dot{\mu} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ being the gen. of the subject ( $\delta \dot{v} \mu \epsilon i s \quad \dot{v} \sigma \tau \epsilon p \eta \sigma \alpha \tau \epsilon$, Theoph.), and so a kind of gen. possessivus, and $\tau \hat{\eta}$ s $\lambda$ elcoupr., the gen: of the object in reference to which the $\dot{v} \sigma \tau \epsilon \in \rho \eta \alpha$ was evinced, and so a gen. of what has been termed 'the point of view :' see Scheuerl. Synt. § 17. 2, p. 127 sq., where these double genitives are briefly but clearly discussed ; comp, also Winer, Gr. § 30. 3. 3, p. 172. There is therefore in the words no call to modesty or humility (Chrys.) on the ground that $\delta$ $\pi \alpha, \nu \tau e s$
 this would imply a virtual connection of $\dot{\nu} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ with $\lambda$ eırouprias, but only a gentle and affectionate notice of the complete nature of the services of the emissary. All that the Philippians lacked was the joy and privilege of a personal ministration; this Epaphrod. by executing the commission with which he was charged ( $\tau \hat{\eta} s \pi \rho o ́ s ~ \mu \in \lambda \in i \tau$. comp. verse 25) supplied, - and to the full. It would thus seem probable that the illness of Epaphroditus was connected, not with his journey, but with his anxious attendance on the apostle at Rome. See Meyer in loc., who has well explained the true meaning of this dolicate and graceful commendation.

Chapter III. 1. $\left.\tau \delta \lambda o \iota \pi \delta^{2}\right]^{\prime}$ 'Finally;' preparation for, and transition to, the concluding portion of the Epistle, again repeated yet more specifically ch. iv. 8 : compare 2 Cor. xiii. 11, I Thess.
iv. 1, 2 Thess. iii. 1, and for the grammatical difference between this and the gen. toû خoımov̂, sce notes on Gal. vi. 17. There is perhaps a slight difficulty in the fact, that subjects previously alluded to are again touched on, and that the personal relation of the apostle to tise Judaists is so fully stated in a concluding portion of the Epistle. Without having recourse to any arbitrary hypotheses (comp. Van Heng.), it seems enough to say, first, that the exhortations all assume a more generic form,- $\chi$ aip $\rho \tau \epsilon$, as Wiesing. remarks, is the key-note ; and secondly, as Alf. suggests, that the mention of кататонخ leads to one of those digressions, expressively but too familiarly, termed by Paley, 'going off at a word,' which so noticeably characterize the writings of the inspired apostle : see Horce Paul. ch. vi. 3.
$\chi \alpha\{\rho \in \tau \in \in \mathcal{K} v \rho\{\omega]$ 'rejoice in the Lord ;' their joy is to be no joy кatà $\tau \grave{\nu} \nu$ $\kappa \delta \sigma \mu \circ \nu$, hollow, earthly, and unreal, but a $\pi \nu \in \nu \mu a \tau \iota k \grave{\eta}$ งิง $\mu \eta \delta i$ (Theod.), a joy in
 $\chi \alpha \rho \alpha \nu$, Chrys. : compare ch. iii. 19, 24, 29, and notes. $\tau \grave{\alpha} \alpha u ̉ \tau \alpha\}$ It is very doubtful to what these words refer. Out of the many opinions that have been advanced, three deserve consideration ; $(a)$ that they refer to exhortations in a lost Epistle (Flatt, Mey.); (b) that they refer to oral communications, whether made to the Phil. person ally (Calv.), or recently communicated to Timothy and Epaphr. (Wieseler); (c) that they refer to the words just precerling, viz. $\chi \alpha\{\rho \in \tau \in \mathcal{E} \nu \mathrm{K} \nu \rho i \varphi(W i e-$ sing., Alf.). Of these (a), whatever may be said of the general question (see notes on Col. iv. 16), must here be pronounced in a high degree doubtful and precarious, and is expressly rejected by Theodoret:

the remark in Polyc. Phil. § 3, ôs kal
 fairly neutralized by 'epistolæ ejus,' ch. 11, see Wies. Chron. p. 460, and comp. Wordsw. in loc. The second (b) is well defended by Wieseler, l. c., p. 459 sq., but implies an emphasis on रpáфetv, which neither the language nor the order of the words in any way substantiates. The last (c) appears on the whole open to least objection, as $\chi$ aipetv does seem the pervading thought of the Epistle, ch. i. 4,18 , ii. 17 , iv. 4,10 , and to have been the more dwelt upon as the actual circumstances of the case might have very naturally suggested the contrary feeling: compare Chrys. Hom. x. init., who, however, refers $\tau \grave{\alpha}$ aủ ${ }^{\text {ch }}$ to what follows, theugh admitting the appropriate nature of the precept. The grammatical objection to the plural $\tau \grave{\alpha}$ aù $\tau \grave{\alpha}$ (Van Heng.) is of no weight; the plural idiomatically refers to and generalizes the foregoing precept, hinting at the particulars which it almost necessarily involves; see Jelf, Gr. § 383, Kühner on Xenoph. Mem. III. 6. 6, and the examples collected by Stallbaum on Plato, Apol. p. 19 d, and Gorg. p. 447 A.
ỏк к v $\rho \rho \delta \nu$ ] 'grierous,' 'irksome ;' compare Soph., CEd. Rex. 834, n̄̀î̀ $\tau \alpha \hat{v} \tau$ ' òкขпра́. The primary idea of öкцоs and бк䒑npds seems that of 'delay,' or 'loitering,' whether from fear or sloth (Matth. xv. 26, Rom. xii. 11), and thence that which is productive of such feelings in others. The derivation is uncertain; perhaps from Sanscr. vale, with the notion of 'bending,' 'stooping;' or 'cowering' (?), see Benfey, Wurzellex. Vol. II. p. $22 . \quad \grave{a} \sigma \phi \propto \bar{\epsilon} \epsilon]^{\prime}$ 'sure,' 'safe; ' i.e. in effect, as Syr. paraphrases,
 quod vos commonefaciunt]. The word is pressed both by Wieseler (l.c.) and

De W., though on different sides, and is confessedly somewhat singularly used. It seems, however, suitable on the grounds alleged above, viz., that the Philippians might think they had every reason-not $\chi$ aípeเข but $\alpha$ àv $\mu \in i ้$. The quasi-causative sense is parallel to that in ỏкข $\frac{1}{\rho o ́ v}$; compare Joseph. Antig. III. 2. 1.
2. $\beta \lambda \epsilon \in \pi \in \tau \epsilon]$ 'look to,' 'observe ;' 'videte,' Vulg., Goth., Copt, not 'beware of,' Auth. Ver., with Syr., this being a derived meaning (Winer, Gram. §32. 2, p. 200): AEth. (Platt) unites both. This exhortation not unnaturally follows. The remembrance of the many things that wrought against $\tau \grave{x}$ रaíp. ėv Kup. rises before the apostle ; one of the chief among which,-perhaps immediately suggested by the word $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \phi a \lambda \epsilon$ 's, - he now enumerates. It was here that a $\sigma \phi{ }^{\prime} \lambda \mu a$ was in some degree to be feared. Toùs кúvas] 'the dogs,' not so much, in the classical use of the term, in ref. to the impudence (Poll. Onom. V. 65), or the snarling and reviling spirit (Athen. IIII. § 93), of those so designated,-as in the Jewish use, in ref. to the impure (Rev. xxii. 15), and essentially ethnic (Matth. xv. 27, comp. Schoettg. Hor. Vol. 1. p. 1145), and antichristian character of these spiritual enemies of the Philippians; $\tilde{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ of E'Nेขucol ral roû
 Chrys. toìs какоѝs है $\rho \gamma$.] 'the evil workers;' compare 2 Cor. xi. 13, $\psi \in \cup \delta a \pi \delta \delta \sigma \tau 0 \lambda 0 l$, द̇ $\rho \gamma a ́ r a l ~ \delta o ́ \lambda ı o l ; ~ t h e y ~$
 Na. was $\epsilon \pi l$ к $\alpha \kappa \hat{\varphi}$, Chrys. The use of the articlo scems to show that there were some whom the apostle especially had in his thoughts.

т $\boldsymbol{\eta} \nu$ $\kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \tau 0 \mu \dot{n} \nu]$ 'the concision,' Auth.; i. e. 'the concised' ('curti Judri,' Hor. Sat. x. 9. 70), 'truncatos in circumcisione,' AEthiop. (Platt) appy. [but (?), as



the word in the original has also ref. to excommunication ; compare Theod.]: a studiedly contemptuous paronomasia, sce examples in Winer, Gr. § 68. 2, p. 561. The apostle will not say $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \tau о \mu$ ', as this, though now abrogated in Christ (1 Cor. vii. 19, Gal. vi. 15), had still its spiritual aspects (ver. 3, Rom. ii. 29, Col. ii. 11),-bat кататоди́, a mere hand-wrought, outward mutilation (compare Eph. ii. 11), which these false teachers gloried in and sought to enforce on
 кататє́ $\mu \nu$ vovalv, Chrys. The reference to excommunication (Theod., Hammond) scems wholly out of place: indeed it is singular that such a very intelligible alIusion should have received so many, and some such monstrous interpretations, e. g. Baur, Paulus, p. 435.
3. $\hat{\eta} \mu \in \hat{\imath}$ s $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ r. $\tau . \lambda$.$] 'For we are$ the circumcision ;' reason for the designation immediately preceding: 'I say к $\alpha$ tarou' , for you and I, whether circumcised in the body or no, are the circumcision, $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \tau о \mu$ र́, in its highest, truest, and spiritual sense, - the circumeised in heart, $=\mathfrak{L}$ - 2 (Ezek. xliv. 7);' sce Tom. ii. 29, and the good note of Fritz. in loc. On the spiritual aspects of $\pi \in \rho t-$ rouń, see particularly Ebrard, Abendm. § 2, Vol. 1. p. 23 sq., Kurtz, Gesch. der Alt. Bund. § 58. 3, p. 184 sq., where the subject is well discussed.
oi $\Pi \nu \in \dot{v} \mu \alpha \tau$ t к.т. $\lambda$.] 'who by the Spirit of God are serving ;'? apposition by means of the substantival participle (compare Winer, Grr. §45.7, p. 316), and indirect epexcegesis of the preceding collective designation. The sentence might have been expressed by means of örol or oiftves with the indicative, but the former would have too muel limited the class, while the latter would have
scemed too purely explanatory of the allusion, and so would have weakened the force of the antithesis. The dative $\Pi \nu \in \dot{v} \mu$. is not the dative normee (Van Heng., compare notes on Gal. v. 16), but, as the context seems to require, the dative instrumenti, or what Krüger perhaps more correctly terms, the 'dynamic' dat. (Sprachl. §48. 15), compare Rom. viii. 14, Galat. v. 5,18 , al. ; the Moly Spirit was the influence under which the $\lambda a \tau \rho e$ ía was performed ; compare John iv. 23. The reading $\Theta \in o \hat{v}$ rests upon the authority of all the uncial MSS. except $\mathrm{D}^{2}$; more than 60 mss ; Copt., Syr. (Philox), in marg., al., and is adopted by all modern editors. It is to be recgretted that Middleton (Gr. Art. p. 371) should be led by a doubtful theory to oppose himself to such a preponderance of authority. It scems perfectly reasonable to consider $\Pi \nu \in \hat{\nu} \mu a, \Theta \epsilon o \hat{\nu}$ as a proper name, and as having a similar freedom in respect to the article; sec Fritz. Rom. viii. 4, Vol. 11. p. 105, compare notes on (fal. v. 5 .
$\lambda \alpha \tau \rho \in \dot{v}$ o $\nu \tau \in s]$ Absolutely, as in Luke ii. 37, Acts xxvi. 7, Heb. ix. 9, x. 2. For a sermon on this and the following verses, more, however, resembling a commentary, see Augustine, Serm. clarix. Vol. v. p. 915 sq. (ed. Migne).
кal oủk к. т. $\lambda_{\text {.] ' 'and not trusting in }}$ the flesh;' opposition to the preceding, though still under the vinculum of a common article: 'we boast in Christ Jesus, - and in the flesh, the bodily and external, far from boasting as they did (Gal. vi. 13), we go not so far even as to put trust.' On the definite negation implicd by os with the part., see Winer, Gr. § 55. 5, p. 430, Green, Gr. p. 120. इà $\rho \xi$ does not specially and exclusively refer to circumcision, but, as the widening


nature of the context seems to suggest, to the outward, the carthly, and the phenomenal; see Hofmann, Scliriftt. Vol. I. p. 541, Müller, Doctr. of Sin, I1. 2, Vol. I. p. 353 (Clark).
4. каî̃єр є̇ $\gamma \dot{\omega}$ к. т. 入.] 'although myself having,' etc.; concessive sentence introduced by kairrep, qualifying the assertion which immediately precedes; sce Denalds. Gr. § 621. The construction involves but little difficulty. In the preceding $\hat{\eta} \mu \epsilon i$ is and où $\pi$ тerot̀े. the apostle is himself included : lest this disavowal
 attributed to the absence or forfciture of clains, rather than the renunciation of them, he passes at once by means of ' $\gamma \dot{\omega} \dot{\omega}$ to his own case, and proceeds as if the foregoing clause had been in the singular: ' I put no trust in the flesh, though, as far as externals are concerned, I for my part have an inalienable and de jure right (ě $\chi \omega \nu$ ) to do so.' Thus, then, kal$\pi \epsilon \rho$ has its proper construction with the part., and the concessive sentence a simple and perspicuous relation to the foregoing clause. Kairep, only used in this place by St. Paul (Heb. v. 8, vii. 5, xii. 17, 2 Pet. i. 12), has its regular meaning, ' even very much ' (see Klotz, Devar. Vol. 1I. p. 723), the $\pi \overline{\text { èp }}$ ( $\pi$ epl) giving to the simple kal the idea of ' ambitum rei majorem' (Klotz), or perlhaps, more probably, the intensive meaning of 'through-ness' or 'completion;' see Donalds. Cratyl. \& 178. Thio meaning 'though,' it need scarcely be said, arises from its combination with the participle.
 even in the flesh,' 'in it as well as $\frac{t \nu}{} \mathrm{X} \rho$.,' the force of kal being apparently descensive; see notes on Gal. iii. 4. There is no reason for modifying the meaning of this word ('gloriandi argumentum,' Calv.), or that of the simple pres. part.

е̌ $\chi \omega \nu$ ('rom preteritam facit presentem,' Van Heng.) : $\pi$ eтoíc. is simply $\chi$ aúx $\eta_{-}$ ots, $\pi a j p \eta \sigma i \alpha$, Chrys., and is actually now possessed by the apostle; he still has it, though he will not use it ; 'habens, non utens,' Beng.
$\delta o k \in \hat{\imath}$ is certainly not pleonastic (see examples in Winer, Gr. § 65. 7, p. 540), but may be cither $(a)$ in the opinion of others, - 'videtur esse, quam vere esse dicere mavult,' Fritz. Matth. iii. 9, p. 129, compare 1 Cor. xi. 16, where such a meiosis seems plausible; or (b) in his ovy opinion, - 'opinionem qua quis sibi placeat,' Van Heng., as 1 Cor. iii. 18, viii. 3 , al., and appy. in the great majority of cases in the N. T. The latter seems best to suit the presumptuous, subjective $\pi \in \pi<1$ ì $\eta \sigma$ ts of these Judaists, and does not seem at rariance (Mey.) with.
 which follows: so Syr., and apparently Copt., 左th. (Platt).
 days old when circumcised, lit. in respect. of circumcision,' dat. of 'reference,' Winer, Gr. § 31. 6, p. 193, notes on Gal. i. 22. Ritualistic distinction, followed by his natal prerogatives, and (ver. 6) his personal and theological characteristics. Circumcision on the eighth day (Levit. xii. 3) distinguished the native Jew, whether from proselyte or Ishmaelite, the latter of whom was circumcised after the thirteentl year, Joseph. Antiq. I. 12. 2. The nom. терirouŕ, which is found in Steph. 3, Elz. (1624, 1633), with some few mss., and apparently Chrys., Theod., is not correct: tho abstract $\pi$ тритонो is suitably used for the concrete in its collective sense (ver. 3), but apparently never, as assumed here, for a single person, Wincr, Gr. § 31.3 (ed. 5) : so Van Heng., Meycr., ék yévous 'I $\sigma \rho$.] 'of the race of Israel;'? gen. of

apposition or identity, Schcuerl. § 12. I, p. 82, 83 : first of the three climactic distinctions in regard to race, tribe, and lineage: 'in censum nune venit splendor natalium,' Van Heng. 'Ек. үє́v. 'I $\sigma \rho$. is exactly equivalent to 'l $\sigma \rho \alpha \eta \lambda i$ in $\eta$ s in the very similar passages, Rom. xi. 3, 2 Cor. xi. 22, and, as the designation 'I $\left.\sigma \rho \alpha{ }^{\prime}\right\rangle \lambda$ suggests (sce Marl. on Eph. ii. 12, Meyer on Cor. xi. 22), stands in distinction to Idumean, Ishmaclite, or ethnic origin in a theocratic point of view; compare also Trench, Synon. § 39.
The $\pi \epsilon \rho i \tau$. showed that the apostle was no proselyte; the $\epsilon^{\epsilon} \kappa \gamma \epsilon \epsilon$. 'I $\sigma \rho$. that he was oủòè $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \eta \lambda u ́ \tau \omega \nu$ yové $\omega \nu$, Chrys. in loc. Meyer and Alf, following Theodoret refer 'I $\sigma \rho$. to the $\pi \rho \sigma$ yovop Jacob, but this seems to mar the symmetry of the climax and the parallelism with Rom. xi. 3 and 2 Cor. xi. 22.
$\phi v \lambda \hat{\eta} s \mathrm{~B} \in \nu \iota \alpha \mu\{\nu]$ 'of the tribe of Benjamin; ' of one of the two most illustrious of the tribes, a true son of the àтокía (Ezra iv. 1). Some of the descendants of the other tribes were still existing, and though amalgamated under the common name, 'Iovóaiol, could still prove their descent ; compare Jost, Gesch. des Isr. Volkes, Vol. I. p. 407 sq. , and Winer, $R W B$. Article 'Stämme,' Vol. II. p. 515. The assertion of Chrys.,

 apparently not historically demonstrable.
 ' $\boldsymbol{r}$ Hebrew of Hebrews,' a Hebrew of Hebrew parentage and ancestry, a Hebrew
 pquev, Theodoret: compare Dion.-Hal.

 róra, and other examples in Kypke, Obs. Vol. II. p. 115. It does not seem proper to limit it merely to Hebrew parents on both sides (Mey., Alf.). Owing
to the loss of private records in earlier times (comp. Ezra ii. 59, 62) and the confusions and troubles in later times, there might have been (even in spite of the care with which private gencalogies were kept, Othon. Lex. Lialb. p. 76, 202) many a Benjamite, espee. among those whoso families had left Palestine, who could not prove a pure Hebrew descent. Thus the Jew of:Tarsus, the Roman citizen, familiarly speaking and writing Greek, might naturally be desirous to vindicate his pure descent, and to claim the honorable title of 'Eßpaîos (ă $\nu \omega \boldsymbol{v}$ ย $\nu$ $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \epsilon \dot{u} \delta o \kappa i \mu \omega \nu$ 'Iov $\delta a i ́ \omega \nu$, Chrys.) for himself and his forefathers; compare Winer, IRIVB. Vol. I. p. 472,475 . That ' $E \beta$ paîos may also have reference to language (Chrys.) is far too summarily denied by Mever and Alford; see Trench, Synon. § 39. That it has reference to locality (Palestinian not Hellenist) is every way doubtful: the asscrtion of Jerome, by which it is supported, that St. Paul was born at Gischala in Palestine, appears only to be, as that writer himself terms it, a 'fabula;' see Neander, Planting, Vol. I. p. $79^{\prime \prime}$ (Bohn).
$k \alpha \tau \grave{\alpha} \nu \delta \mu \circ \nu \kappa . \tau, \lambda$.$] 'in respect of$ the law (of Moses) a Pharisee; ' i.e. in regard of keeping or maintaining it, the prep. karà being used throughout in its more general signification of 'quod attinet ad;' compare Winer, Gr. § 49. d, p.357. Nó ${ }^{\prime}$ os is here the 'Mosaic law:' though it may occasionally have what Reuss calls 'signification economique, tout ce qui tient à l'ancienne dispensation' (Théol. Chrét. Iv. 7, Vol. Ir. p. 66 ), this would be here out of harmony with the following $\delta \iota \kappa a t o \sigma$. $\hat{\eta}$ ėv $\nu \dot{\mu} \mu \varphi$. The present and two following clauses state the theological characteristics of the apostle, arranged perhaps climactically, a Pharisee, a zealous Pharisee, and a blameless Pharisce; comp. Acts xxii.



3，xxvi．5，Gal．i． 14.

6．$\kappa \alpha \tau \grave{\alpha}$ 〈 $\widehat{\eta} \lambda$ ov к．т． ．］＇］＇in respect $^{2}$ of acal－persecuting the Church ；＇comp． Gal．i．13；said here perhaps not without a tinge of sad irony；even in this re－ spect，this mournful exhibition of Judaist zeal，he can，if they will，set himself on a－level with them．If they be Judaists he was more so．The present part．is not for the nor．（Grot．），nor used as the listorical present（Van Heng．），nor as a substantive（the examples referred to by Mey．and Alf．being all associated with the art．），but is used adjectivally，standing in parallelism to the following epithet， ${ }_{\alpha} \mu \epsilon \mu \pi \tau o s$ ，and predicatively in relation to a suppressed verb subst．that pervades＇ the clanses ；comp．Winer，Gr．§ 45．5， p．312．The sense is the same，but grammatical propricty scems to require the distinction．

ठıкаıоб．
Tウ̀ $\nu$ Év $\nu$ ó $\mu \omega$ ］＇righteousness that is in the law；＇righteousness ．specially so characterized，comp．notes on 1 Tim．iii． 14， 2 Tim．i．13．In ver． 9 the same idea is somewhat differently expressed ：$\delta \iota \kappa . \dot{\eta}$ ＇$\kappa$ vóuov is righteousness that emanates from the law，that results from its com－ mands when truly followed；$\delta \iota \kappa$ ．＇$\eta$ èv $\nu \delta \mu \omega$ rightcousness that resides in it，and exists in coincidence with its commands． In the one case the law is the imaginary origin，in the other the imaginary sphere， of the סıratooúvy．All limitations of ifرos，e．g．＇specialia instituta，＇Grot．， ＇traditionem patrum，＇Vatabl．，are com－ pletely untenable．On this verse，and on Justification generally，see August． Serm．ccax．Vol．v．p． 926 sq．（edit． Migne）．
$\left.\not{ }_{\alpha} \mu \in \mu \pi \tau \circ \mathrm{s}\right]$
＇blameless；＇＇propric est is in quo nilil desiderari potest，$\nsim \mu \omega \mu$ os in quo nihil est quod reprehendas，＇Tittm．Synon．p． 29. The $\alpha \mu \epsilon \mu \phi i ́ \alpha$ here spoken of，in accord－ ance with the clearly external relations
previously enumerated，must be referred to the outward and common judgment of men ；＇vitæ meæ rationes ita plane composui ut nihil in me quisquam rep－ rehendere aut damnare posset，＇Justini－ ani in loc．

7．吴 $\tau \iota \nu \alpha]$＇the which things；＇scil． the qualities，characteristics，and prercg． atives alluded to in the preceding clauses， öatis being used in reference to indefi－ nitely expressed antecedents；see notes on Cial．iv．24．The general distinction between ôs and öбтts has rarely been stated better than by Krüger；＇is is purely objective，öбтts generic and qual－ itative，＇Sprachl．§ 51． 8.
गुण $\mu$ ot кє́ $\rho \delta \eta$ ］＇were gains to me；＇ not，＇in my judgment，＇＇non vera sed opinata lucra，＇Van IIeng．，$\mu 0$ b being thus an ethical dative（Krüger，Sprachl． § 48．6．5），－but＇to me，a simplo dat． commodi；they were really gains to St． Paul in the state previous to his conver－ sion；compare Schoettg．in loc．The plural кє́ $\rho \delta \eta$ is appropriately used in ref－ crence to the different forms and charac－ ters of $\kappa$ époos involved in the foregoing prerogatives ；кє́pōos，in fact，considered in the plurality of its parts，Jelf，Gr． § 355．1，Irüger，Sprachl．§ 44．3．5． Meyer compares Herod．III． $71, \pi \epsilon \rho \iota \beta a \lambda-$
 Ix．p． 862 c，$\beta \lambda \alpha$ ब́ßas каl кє́рठ̀ך．
$\delta \iota$ à $\tau \delta \nu \mathrm{X} \rho$ ．］＇for Christ＇s sake，＇more fully explained in ver． 8,9 ，and put，for the sake probably of emphasis，between the rerb and its accusative．Chrys．here not inappropriately remarks，$\epsilon i \delta i \dot{\alpha} \tau<\partial \nu$

\＄$\quad \eta \eta \mu a t \quad \zeta \eta \mu\{\alpha \nu]$＇$I$ have considered （and they are now to me）as loss；＇con－ trast in $\gamma o \hat{v} \mu a t$ ，ver． 8 ，and on the force of the perfect，which here marks＇actionem quæ per effectus suos durat，＇see notes on Eph．ii．8．Meyer，followed by Alf．，



comments on the use of the sing. $\xi^{2} \mu$ íav as marking 'one loss in all things' of which the apostle is here speaking. This is possible, but it may be doubted whether the singular is not regularly used in this formula (comp, examples in Kypke, Vol. II. 315, Elsner, Vol. II. p. 252, and especially Wetst. in loc.), and whether the use of the plural would not suggest the inappropriate idea of 'punishments,' a prevalent meaning of '¡puias: see Rost u. Palm, Lex. s. v. The form $\zeta \eta \mu$. is supposed to be connected with 'damnum,' and perhaps to be referred to the Sanscr. dam, 'domitum esse,' Pott, Etym. Forsch. Vol. I. p. 261.
8. à $\lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu$ 'o $\begin{array}{c}\nu \\ \nu\end{array}$ к. т. $\left.\lambda.\right]$ 'Nay more, am indeed also, etc. ;' 'at sane quidem,' Winer, Gr. § 53. 7, p. 392. In this formula, scarcely accurately rendered by 'imo vero,' Wiesinger (after Winer, ed. 5), or 'but morcover,' Alf., each particle has its proper force ; $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha}$ contrasts the pres. $\mathfrak{i j \gamma o v} \mu a t$ with the perf. ที $\gamma \eta \mu \alpha t, \mu \notin \nu$ confirms, while oủ $\nu$, with its usual retrospective force, collects and slightly concludes from what has been previously said; see Klotz, Devar. Vol. II. p. 663 , and for the use of $\mu \hat{\epsilon} \nu$ oủ $\nu$ in adding some emphatic addition or correction, comp. Donalds. Gr. §567. The continuative force of $\mu \in \grave{\nu} \nu \hat{u} \nu$, ' cum quầdam conclusionis significatione,' is noticed by Herm. Viger, No. 342.
The reading of Rec., $\mu \in \nu 0 \hat{v} \nu \gamma \epsilon$, rests only on A ; very many mss. ; Theoph., al., and is rightly rejected by Lachm. and Tisch. ка! ทं $\gamma о \hat{v} \mu a t]$ ! $I$ am also accounting ;' not only $\boldsymbol{\eta} \gamma \eta \mu \alpha \iota$ but ทं $\gamma 0 \hat{\mu} \mu a l$, the кal, with its usual ascensive, and indirectly contrasting, force, bring. ing into prominence the latter verb: it is not with St . Paul merely a past but also a present action.
$\pi \alpha \nu \tau a]$ 'all,'-in reference to the preceding ärıva ̂̂̀ к. т. $\lambda_{\text {., }}$ 'illa omnia,' Syr., Copt.; $\pi \alpha ́ \nu \tau a$, as its position shows, having no emphasis, but being used only to include 'qucccunque antea Apostolo in lucris posita sunt,' Van IIeng.
The fuller and regular construction, $\zeta \eta$ uíav cîyaı (compare Weller, Bemerk: zum Gr. Synt. p. 8,-an ingenious tract), is here adopted on account of the difference in the order of the words.
$\delta \iota \alpha ̀ \tau \delta \quad \hat{v} \pi \in \rho, \kappa . \tau . \lambda$.$] 'for the excel-$ lency of the knowledge of Christ my Lord,' - 'qui mihi super omnia est,' Grotius, 'dominus mihi carissimus,' Van Heng.; compare Est. in loc. The article with the neuter adjectival participle seems designedly used to bring into prominence the specific characteristic or attribute of the $\gamma \nu \bar{\omega} \sigma t s$; it was not merely $\delta \iota \alpha \alpha^{\prime} \tau \eta \nu$
 $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$. ., sce Bernharily, Synt. III. 42. d, p. 156, and compare Jelf, Gr. § 436. $\gamma$, who notices this use of tho neuter part. as very characteristic of Thucydides, I. 142, 1I. 63, III. 43, al. This nicety of language was not unobserved by Chrysost., who adverts to it to show that the real difference between the $\gamma \nu \bar{\omega} \sigma t s$ and the $\pi \alpha ́ \nu \tau a$ (involving the $\nu \delta \mu o s$ ) with which it was contrasted, lay solely in the $\dot{\sim} \pi \epsilon \rho-$ ox̀̀ of the former; $\delta i \grave{\alpha} \tau \delta$ ú $\pi \epsilon \rho \in \mathfrak{\chi} \chi \nu \nu$, où
 $\delta \mu о \gamma \in \nu o u ̂ s$ virє $\rho \in ́ \chi \in!$. The deduction, however, is unnecessary if not untenaable. . The knowledge of Christ admits no. homogencities, and transcends all comparisons.
$\tau \alpha \alpha_{\alpha} \pi{ }^{2} \tau \alpha$ ' $\$ \eta \mu$.] 'I suffered the loss of them all;:' not with any middle force but purely passive, the retrospective and inclusive $\tau \alpha ̀ ~ \pi \alpha ́ \nu \tau \alpha$ (каl. $\tau a ̀ ~ \pi \alpha ́ \lambda \alpha \iota, ~ к а l ~ \tau a ̀ ~ \pi a ́ p o \nu \tau \alpha$, Chrys.) being the regular accus. of the (so termed) quantitative object; comp.



Matth．xvi．26，and see Hartung，Casus， p．46，comp．Winer，Gr．§ 39．1，p． 223. The verb is designedly stronger than the preceding ทर $\gamma$ oû $\mu a \iota$ § $\eta \mu i \alpha \nu$ ，and its object－ accus．more comprehensive ；both suita－ bly enhancing the climactic sequence of this noble verse．кal $\dot{\eta} \gamma o \hat{v}$－ $\mu a b \sigma \kappa \dot{v} \beta$ ．Gival］＇and count them to be dung；＇clearly not a parenthetical clause（Van Heng．），but，as the nature of the verse indicates，joined．to，and in sentiment advancing further than what has last been said．The colon in some editions（Oxf．1836，1851），is very unde－ sirable ；even the comma（Mill，Griesb．， Scholz，Tisch．）can be dispensed with． The somewhat curious word бки́ßa入ov appears properly to mean＇dung＇（Syr．， Clarom．，Vulg．），e．g．Alex．－Aphrodit． Probl．1．18，द̇ध̧เâбı бкúß．каl oûpov，and thus is probably to be connected with $\sigma \kappa \hat{\rho}$（not $\sigma \kappa \omega \rho$ ），gen．бкатós ；sce Lo－ beck，Pathol．p．92，Benfey，Wurzellex． Vol．II．p．172．The old derivation， кибi $\beta a \lambda \epsilon i v, ~ i . ~ e . ~ к \cup \sigma i \beta \alpha \lambda o \nu ~(S u i d ., ~ E t y m . ~$ M．）or＇s kúvas，is still defended by P＇ott， Etym．Forsch．Vol．11．p．295．On the various derivative meanings，＇refuse，＇ ＇quisquilias＇（Goth．，Eth．），etc．，see Suicer，Thesaur．s．v．Vol．1r．p．978， the numerous exx．collected by Wetst． in loc．，and the smaller collections of Kypke，Elsner，and Loesner．
Iva X $\rho, \kappa \in \rho \delta \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega]$＇that I may gain Christ ；＇purpose of the $\dot{\eta} \gamma$ ．$\sigma \kappa \dot{v} \beta$ ．єival， antithetically expressed with reference to the previous Snu⿺ỗơat．Meyer and Alf．properly object to the bleak interpr． of Grot．，＇Christum，i．e．Christi favo－ rem ：＇it is curious that it should have been adopted by so good an expositor as Hammond．To＇gain Christ＇is，to use the exquisite language of Bp．IIall，＇to lay fast hold upon Him，to reccive Him inwardly into our bosoms，and so to
make Him ours and ourselves His，that we may be joined to Him as our Head， espoused to Him as our Husband，incor－ porated into Him as our Nourishment， engrafted in Him as our Stock，and laid upon Him as a sure Foundation，＇Christ Mystical，ch．vi．－a treatise of the lofti－ est spiritual strain．
9．$\epsilon \dot{U} \rho \in \hat{N} \hat{\omega} \quad \dot{\varepsilon} \nu \alpha \dot{v} \tau \hat{\varphi}]$＇be found in Him，,$'$ in Him，as the sphere and ele－ ment of my spiritual being ；comp．notes
 not be regarded as a mere periphrasis for the verb subst．，＇existam sive sim，＇Gro－ tius（see contra Wincr，Gr．§65．8，p． 542），nor as referring solely to the judg－ ment of God（Beza），nor yet as antithet－ ical to being lost（Bp．Hall），but simply and plainly to the＇judicium universale． （Zanch．），＇the being and being actually found to be $\epsilon$ è $\alpha u ̉ r \hat{\omega}$ ，＇both in the sight of God and his fellow men ；see notes on Gal．ii． 17.
$\mu$ ทे ढ้ $\chi \omega \nu$ ］ Dependent on the preceding $\% \nu \alpha$ ，and as－ sociated with the preceding єupeNT⿳⺈ as a predication of manner．Tischend．and Lachm．both remove the comma after $\epsilon \nu$ aut $\hat{\varphi}$ ，thus leaving it doubtful whether $\mu \hat{\eta}$ éx $\chi \omega \nu$ may not form a portion of an objective sentence（Donalds．Gr．§ 584 sq．），＇be found in Him not to have，etc．＇ －a construction that is grammatically defensible（comp．Krüger，Sprachl． 56. 7．2），but certainly not exegetically sat－ isfactory： $\bar{\epsilon} \nu$ aủr $\hat{\omega}$ would then bo wholly obscured；comp．Meyer in loc．
$\left.\epsilon^{\prime} \mu \dot{\jmath} \nu \delta \iota \kappa . \kappa . \tau . \lambda_{\text {．}}\right]$＇my righteousness that is of the law ；＇i．e．such righteous－ ness as I strove to work out by attempt－ ing to obey the behests of the law，rì $\nu$ isíav סıкаเoбúv $\eta \nu$ ，Rom．x．3．The mean－ ing of $\delta \iota \kappa \alpha \ldots \sigma$ ．is here slightly different in its two connections．With $\epsilon^{\mu} \mu \eta \nu$ it implies an assumed attributo of the apos－ tle，with $\mathfrak{\text { é } \kappa} \nu \delta \mu \circ v$ it implies a righteous：

ness reckoned as such，owing to a fulfil－ ment of the claims of the law．On the force of $\epsilon_{k}$ in these combinations（＇im－ mediate origin，＇etc．），see notes on Caal． ii． 16.
$\tau \eta \nu \nu$ ઠ̀ $\pi$ 亿 $\sigma \tau, \mathrm{X} p$ ．］ ＇that which is throuyh faith in Christ；＇ of which faith in Christ is the＇causa medians，＇and which，as the following words specify，comes immediately from God as its active source and origin； compare Waterl．on Justif．Vol．vı．p． 4 note，Usteri，Lehrb．II．1．1，p．87．On the meaning of $\pi i \sigma \tau . \mathrm{X} \rho$ ．and the dog－ matical import of $\delta$ ic̀ $\pi i \sigma \tau$ ．，see notes on Gal．ii． 16 （comp．notes on Col．ii．12）， where both expressions are briefly dis－ cussed；and also the short but extremely perspicuous remarks of Hamm．，Pract． Catech．1．4，who well observes that our ＇faith itself cannot be regarded，in the strict sense of the term，as a logical in－ strument of our justification，but as a condition and moral instrument without which we shall not be justificd，＇ p .78 （ 1 ．－ C．Libr．）；so also with equal perspicuity Forbes，Instruct．viII．23．22．On the true doetrine of justification see espec． Hooker，on Justif．§ 6 sq．．，and for the opposing tenets of the Romanists the clear statements of Möhler，Symbolik， § 15，p． 148 sq．，§ 22, p．215， 216.
$\dot{\epsilon} \pi i \cdot \tau \hat{\jmath} \pi\{\sigma \tau \in t]$＇based on fuith；＇not ＇sub hâc conditione ut habeas，＇Fritz， （Rom．Vol．I．p．46），but＇super fide，＇ Copt．，Beng．，miotis being the founda－ tion on which it firmly and solidly rests． On the force of $\xi \pi$ ？with the dative，which， roughly speaking，denotes a more close， while with the gen．it expresses a less close connection（Kruiger，Spprachl．§ 68. 41．1），see notes on ch．i．3，and csp．on Eph．ii．20，－where，however，observe that（in ed．1）the words＇＇former＇and ＇latter＇have become accidentally trans－ posed．Numerous examples of $\overline{e \pi} \boldsymbol{i}$ with both cases（apparently interchangeably） will be found in［Eratosth．］Catusterismi，
ap．Gale，Myythol．p．99－135，but the work is of very doubtrul date． The connection is not perfectly clear ；द̀ $\pi l \tau \hat{\imath}$ \＃i $\sigma \tau \epsilon t$ has been joined，$(a)$ with the suc－ cecding тov̂ $\gamma \nu \omega ิ \nu a l$, IEth．（Pol．，but not Platt），Clurys．，and，with a different ap－ plication，Calv．，Beng．；（b）with the remotely preceding é $\chi \omega \nu$, MIey．；（c）with the immediately preceding סurauoovivnv， Vulg．，Copt．，Goth．Of these（ $a$ ）is not tenable ；sce below on verso 10 ；（（ ）is improbable and larsh，owing to the dis－ tance of $\dot{\epsilon} \pi l \tau \hat{\eta} \pi$ ．from ë $\chi \omega \nu$ ；（c）on the other hand is grammatically defensible， and eminently simplo and perspicuous．
 so $\delta \iota k$ ．$\dot{\epsilon} \pi l \mid \hat{\eta} \pi \not \pi \sigma \tau$ ．without the art．is permissible，sce Winer，Gir．$\$ 20.2, \mathrm{p}$ ． 123，and comp．notes on Eph．i． 15.

10．$\tau 0 \hat{v} \gamma \nu \hat{\omega} \nu a t$ ］＇that $I$ nay linow Ifin，＇Auth．Ver．；infinitive of design dqpendent on the preceding eivpeิ⿳亠丷⿵冂，not on $\mu$ i） É $^{\chi} \omega \nu$（（Mey．）；which secms to give an undue prominence to the participial clausc．The reference of $\tau 0 \hat{u} \gamma^{\gamma} \nu \bar{\omega} v a l$ （ $=$ iva $\gamma \nu \bar{\omega}$ ）to ver． 8 ，as Winer，De W．， at．，seems to disturb the easy and natu－ ral sequence of thought；see Wiesinger and Alf．in loc．On the infin．＇of do－ sign，＇which falls under the general head of the gen．of suljective relation（compare Kruiger，Sprachl．$\$ 47,22,2$ ），and is by no means without example in classical Greek（Bernhardy，Synt．ix．2，p．357， Madvig，Synt．§ 170 c），seo Winer，Gr． §44．4，p．291，where other examples aro noticed and discussed．The con－ struction of $\tau o \hat{v} \gamma \nu \hat{\omega} v a l$ with $\overline{2} \pi i \quad \tau \hat{\imath} \pi i \sigma \tau$ ．，
 गरीs $\pi i \sigma \tau \epsilon \omega$（ Thicod．，Chrys．），is op－ posed to the order of words，and to all rules of grammatical analysis，－if $(6)$ as adefinitive gen．，＇so as to know Him＇ （Calv．，Beng．），is a construction of $\pi / \sigma$－ ris not found in the N．T．；sco Meyer and Alf．

The knowledge here mentioned，as Meyer righltly observes，is



not merely speculative, but practical and experimental ; see especially Beck, Seelenl. 1. 9, p. 22, comp. Andrewes, Serm. Vol. ir. p. 204 ( (.-C. Libr.).
кal тìv $\delta \dot{v} \nu . \kappa . \tau . \lambda$.] 'and the power of His resurrection;' fuller explanation of the preceding à̀óv, under two different aspects, the Lord's resurrection, and the Lord's sufferings. The $\delta \dot{v} v a \mu s \tau_{\bar{\eta} s}$ àva.ar, is clearly not 'potentia quâ excitatus fuit,' Vatabl. (àvaot, being a gen. oljecti), but, ' quâ justos ad immortalitatem revocabit,' Just., - à $\alpha \sigma \sigma$. being the gen. originis (Hartung, Casus, p. 23); ' $a$ virtue or power flowing from Christ's resurrection, called by the apostle vis resurrectionis,' Andrewes, Serm. Vol. II. p. 204 (^.-C. Libr.) ; compare Theoph. As the resurrection of Christ has at least four spiritual efficacies, viz. (a) as quickening our souls, Eph. ii. 5; (b) as confirming the hope of our resurrection, Rom. viii. 11, 1 Corinth. xv. 22 ; (c) as assuring us of our present justification, Rom. iv. 24,25 ; (d) as securing our final justification, our triumph over death, and participation in His glory, 2 Corinth. iv. 10 sq., Colos. iii. 4,- the context can alone determine the immediate reference. Here the general context seems to point to $(c)$ or $(d)$, the present verse and ver. 11, perhaps more especially to the latter. On the fruits of Christ's resurrection, see Pearson, Crecd, Art. v. Vol. r. p. 313, Usher, Body of Div. ch. xr. ad fin., and on our justification by Christ's resurrection compared with that by His death, the admirable remarks of Jackson, Creed, xv. 16. 8.
$\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \kappa 0 \iota \nu \omega \nu\{a \nu \kappa . \tau . \lambda$.$] 'the fillow-$ ship of His sufferings ;' further exemplification of the experimental knowledge of Christ, regarded as objective and present, suggested by the preceding clause,
of which the reference was rather subjective and future. It is only in a participation in IIis sufferings that there can be one in His resurrection and glory: $\epsilon i$

 $\mu \in \nu$, 'Theoph. ; compare Rom. viii. 17, 2 Tim. ii. 11. This partnership in Christ's sulferings is outward and actual (Chrys., al.), not inward and ethical (Zanch.); it is a sharing in the sufferings IIe suffered, a drinking from the cup Ho drank; comp. 2 Cor. iv. 10, 1 Pet. iv. 13, notes on 2 Timothy, ii. 11, and Renss, Theul. Chret. Iv. 20, Vol. II. p. 224.
$\sigma v \mu \mu \circ \rho \phi 1 \zeta \delta \mu . \kappa . \tau . \lambda$ ] 'being conformed unto Ifis death,' i. e. 'by being, or while I am, conformed unto His death, cren as I now am :? pres. participle logically dependent on the preceding $\gamma \nu \omega ̂ v a r$; see notes on Eph. iii. 18, iv. 2. This conformation, then, is not ethical, 'ut huic mundo emortuus sim quemadmodum Christus mortuus est in cruce,' Van Heng., but, as the connection and tenor of the passage require, actual, and as the pres. suggests, even now more especially going on: 'ut cognoscam communicntionem passionum cjus, in quam renio, et qux mihi contigit dum per passiones et mortis pericula quæ pro nomine cjus sustineo, conformis efficior morti ejus,' Estius.

The reading is slightly doubtful ; Rec. has $\sigma \nu \mu \mu \circ \rho \phi о \dot{u} \mu \in \nu 0 s$ with D3'EKL; al. ; Chrysost., Theod.: the rarer form in the text is adopted by Lachmann and Tisch, with $\mathrm{ABD}^{1} ; 17$. 67 * * 11 ; Orig. (mss.), Bas., Maced., to which the incorrect $\sigma v \nu$ фортet Só $^{\prime} \mu \in \nu 0 s$ of $F$ and $G$ may lend some slight weight.
11. $\epsilon$ ' $\pi \omega s$ ] 'if by any means,' 'si quomodo,' Vulg., Clarom. ; an expression, not se much of doubt, as of humility, indicating the object contemplated in

I have not yet obtained, but am eagerly pressing forward : in this imitate me.

## ${ }^{12}$ Oủ

$\sigma \nu \mu \mu о \rho \phi!$ §. к. т. $\lambda_{0}$; où సे $\alpha \rho \beta \rho \hat{\omega} \gamma \alpha ́ \rho, \phi \eta \sigma^{i} \nu$,
 see also Neander, Phil. p. 43. In this formula, when thus associated with verbs denoting an action directed to a particular end, the iclea of an attempt is conveyed ('nixum fidei Paulinx,' Beng.), which may or may not be successful; compare Acts xxvii. 12, Rom. i. 10, xi. 14, and sce Fritz. Rom. xi. 14, Vol. II. p. 47, Hartung, Partil. $\epsilon i, 2$ 2. 6, Vol. II. p. 206, and for a few examples of the similar use of si in Latin, Madvig, Lat. $G r . \S 451 . d$.
$\kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \nu \tau \eta \sigma \omega$ $\epsilon i s]$ 'may attain unto;' not indic. fut., as in Rom. i. 10, and perhaps xi. 14 (Mey.), but aor. sulbj. (Alf.), as the following words, $\in i$ каl кат $\alpha \lambda \alpha \beta \omega$, seem to suggest. On the force of $\epsilon i$ with the subj. ('ubi nilil nisi conditio ipsa indicetur'), now admitted and acknowledged in the best Attic Greek, see Herm. de Part. å $\nu$, II. 7, p. 97, Klotz, Devar. Vol. II. p. 499 sq.; comp. Winer, Gr. § 41, 2. c, p. 263. The expression ка่таут $\alpha \nu$ єis, 'pervenire ad,' is used in the N. T. in connection witl places (Acts xvi. 1, xviii. 19,24, al.), persons (1 Cor. $x .11$, xiv. 36), and ethical relations (Acts xxvi. 7, Eph, iv. 13), in which last connection it is also found with $\epsilon \pi i$ several times in Polyb. ; e. g. with gen., Hist. XIv. 1.3 (but ? reading), with accus., IIf. 11. 4, III. 91. 1, XIV. 1.9. The ref, of Van Heng. to time, 'si perveniam ad tempus hujus eventi,' is thus wholly unnecessary, if indeed not also lexically untenable.
$\epsilon \xi \xi \alpha \nu \alpha \sigma \tau \alpha \sigma \iota \nu \kappa . \tau . \lambda$. ' the resurrection from the dead;' $i$. e., as the context suggests, the first resurrection (Rev. xx. 5), when, at the Lord's coming the dead in Him shall rise first (1 Thessalon. iṿ. 16), and the quic. be caught up to meet Him in the clouds (1 Thess. iv. 17) ; comparo Luke xx. 35. The first resurrection will include
only true believers, and will apparently precede the second, that of nou-believers and disbelievers, in point of time; see Ebrard, Dogmatik, §571, and the singular but learned work of Burnet, on the Departed, ch. IX. p. 255 (Transl.). Any reference here to a merely ethical resurrection (Cocceius) is wholly out of the question.

The double compound
 (comp. Polyb. Hist. III. 55. 4), does not appear to have any special force ( $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ दै $\nu$ -
 ophyl.), but scems only an instance of the tendency of later Greek to adopt such forms, without any increase of meaning, see Thiersch, de Vers. Alex. II. 1, p. 83, and notes on Eph. i. 21 : comp. Pearson, Creed, Vol. Ir. p. 316 (edit. Burt.). $\tau \vdots \nu \in \mathcal{\xi} \kappa \nu \in \kappa \rho \hat{\omega} \nu]$ Distinct and slightly emphatic specification of the $\begin{gathered}\epsilon \\ \xi \\ \alpha \\ \alpha \\ \alpha \\ \sigma\end{gathered}$; ; see notes on 1 Tim. iii. 14, 2 Tim. j. 13, where, however, the first art., as being associated with a word of known meaning and common occurrence, is omitted after the prep. The reading is slightly doubtful. Meyer defends Rec. $\epsilon \xi \xi \alpha \nu . \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \nu \in \kappa \rho \omega \hat{\nu}$ ( KL ; al.), on the ground that elsewhere St. Paul regularly omits $\epsilon \mathfrak{k}$; these internal considerations however must yield to such distinct preponderance of external authority as ABDE ; 10 mss ; Syr., and great majority of Vv.; Bas., Chrysost., al. : so Lachin., Tisch.
12. o บ̉ $\chi$ óт t] '(I say) not that:' not so much in confixmation of what precedes (Theoph.), as to avoid misapprehension, and by his own example, to confirm his own exhortations, ch. ii. 3, compare iii. 15 ; 'nolite, inquit, in mo falli; plus me ipse novi quam vos. Si nescio quid mihi desit, nescio quid adsit,' August. On the use of oủ $\chi$ őtı scil. oủk є̇pê ถ̈ $\tau t$, in limiting a preceding assertion or obviating a misapprehension, sco Hax-

tung，Partik．Vol．11．p．154，compare Herm．Viger，No． 253.
そु $\delta \eta$ है $\lambda \alpha \beta$ o $]_{\text {］＇I have already attained．＇}}$ The object of E $\lambda a \beta$ ol is somervhat doubt－ ful．The two most natural supplements are（a）Xpเбтषע，Theod．，implied from what precedes；（b）$\beta$ paßєĩov，Chrys．，re－ flected from what follows．Of these（b） is to be preferred，as the $\delta \iota \omega \kappa \omega$ immedi－ ately following seems to show that the favorite metaphor from the stadium was already occupying the apostle＇s thoughts． The simple e $\kappa \lambda \alpha \beta o \nu$ thus precedes，almost ＇generaliter dictum，＇to be succeeded by the more specific кara入áßw．On the force of $\langle\boldsymbol{j} \delta \eta$ and its distinction from $\nu \hat{v} \nu$ ， sec on 2 Tim．iv． 6.
$\tau \in \tau \in \lambda \in[\omega \mu \alpha \iota]$＇have been made per－ fect：＇more exact explanation of the semi－metaphorical è $\lambda \alpha \beta o \nu$ ，and result of it．The preceding aor．is thus not to be regarded as a perfect，but as represent－ ing a single action in the past（＇ita ut non definiatur，quam late patcat id quod actum est＇），Fritz．de Aoristi Vi，p．17）， which the succeeding perf．explains and expands；comp．Winer，Gr．§40．5，p． 257．That the $\tau \in \lambda \in เ$ ขvoña has here an ethical reference，＇to be spiritually per－ fected，＇not agonistical（Hamm．，Loes－ ner，p．355），＇to be crowned or receive the reward，＇is almost self－evident ：com－ pare Reuss，Théol．Chrét．iv．16，Vol． Ix．p．182．The verb is only used here by St．Paul（2 Cor，xii． 9 is more than doubtful），though common in Hebrews and elsewhere in the N．T．The ancient
 $\alpha \beta \circ \nu$ D1EFG ；Clarom．；Iren．，al．，indi－ rectly shows the meaning here ascribed to $\tau \in \tau \in \lambda \in i \omega \mu \alpha$,
$\delta \iota \omega \kappa \omega \delta \epsilon \in$ ＇but I am pressing onuard；＇not＇sed persequor，＇Beza，but＇［per］－sequor aul－ tem，＇Vulg．，with a more just regard to the force of the particle ：see Hand， Tursell．Voli．1．p．559．In sentences of
this nature，where a negative has pre－ ceded and the regular ă $\lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha}$（sondern） might have been expected（comp．Don－ alds．Cratyl．§ 201）it will be nearly al－ ways found，that the connecrion of the two clauses is oppositive rather than ad － versative ；$i . e$ ．that in the one case（ $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha})$ the preceding negation is brought into sharp prominence and contrasted with what follows，while in the other（ $\delta \hat{\epsilon}$ ）the negation is almost left unnoticed，and the sentence continued with the（so to say）connective opposition that so regu－ larly characterizes the latter particle； see Klotz，Derar．Vol．II．p．360，and compare Hand，l．c．The metaphor is obviously taken from the stadium（Loesn．Obs．p．355，ėmayáviós єi $\mu$ t，Theoph．），and the verb $\delta เ \omega \kappa \kappa \omega$ ，as in the examples cited by Loesn．，and as also in ver． 14 ，scems to be here used absolutely，кađั̀ $\sigma \pi o v \delta \grave{\eta}_{\nu} \nu$ è $\lambda a \dot{v} \nu \epsilon เ \nu$ ，Pha－ vor．；see examples in Kypke，Obs．Vol． 11．p．317，Buttmann，Lexil．§ 40 ，p． 232 （Transl．）：so，distinctly，Syr．，Copt．， ＇curro，＇and apparently Chrys．，who re－ gards it as only differing qualitatively （ $\mu \in \mathrm{N}^{3}$ öбou тठ́vou）from rрé $\chi \omega$ ；see also Theophyl．in loc．If $\delta \iota \omega$ ккш be regarded as transitive，the object of $\delta \iota \omega$ кк w will be the same as that of $\kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha} \beta \omega$ ，scil．the Bpaßeion implied in the＇̇ $\phi^{\prime} \Phi$ ：campare Eth．（Platt）．The former construction， however，seems more simple and natu－ ral．$\left.\quad \in \frac{i}{l} \kappa \alpha k \alpha \tau \alpha \lambda \alpha \beta \omega\right]$ ＇if I might also lay hold on；＇the kal con－ trasting кaza入 $\alpha \beta \omega$ not with the more re－ mote ê $\lambda a \beta o \nu$（Mey．），but with the imme－ diately preceding סi（6́kco（Alf！）：sce Ec－ clus．xi．10，xxvii．8，comp．Rom．ix． 30，Lucian，Hermot．§ 77，Ciccro，Off．I． 31．110，in all which passages there seems a contrast more or less defined
 the＇sequi＇and＇assequi ；＇compare Fritz．Rom．Vol．II．p．355．On the



force of ci kal see notes on chap．ii． 17. Whether катал $\alpha \beta \omega$（＇assequar，＇Rom．ix． 30， 1 Cor．ix．24）is to be taken abso－ lutely or transitively will depend on the meaning assigned to $\epsilon^{\prime} \phi^{\prime} \widehat{\varphi}$ ．
 I was laid hold on；＇so Syriac $>$ مֹ̂s
巴thiopic（Platt），一 the only two ver－ sions that make their view of this pas－ sage perfectly clear．＇E $\phi . \nsubseteq$ has here received several different interpretations． Taken per se it may mean ；（a）quare， like $\alpha \nu \exists^{\prime} \oint \nu(L u k e v . ~ 3)$ ，at the begin－ ning of a sentence ；comp．Diodor．Sic．
 pov к．т．$\lambda . ;(\beta)$ eo quod；proptercu quod，
 Rom．v．12， 2 Corinth．v．4），expressed more commonly in the plural＇＇$\dot{\phi}^{\prime}$ ois in classical Greek；see Thom．M．p．400， ed．Bern．，and Fritz．Rom．Vol．1．p． 299 ； $(\gamma)$ sub quâ conditione，cujus causâ，almost ＇to which very end，＇Hammond（see 1 Thess．iv．17，Gal．v．13，and notes， also examples in Lobeck，Phryn．p．475）， $\$$ being here regarded as the relative to a suppressed antecedent rov̂тo，the obj． accus．of ката入 $\alpha \beta \omega$ ：comp．Luke v． 25. Of these $(\beta)$ and $(\gamma)$ are the only two which here come into consideration．The former is adopted by the Greek commen－ tators，Beng．，Meyer，al．，and deserves consideration，but introduces a reason where a reason seems hardly appropri－ ate．The latter is adopted by Syriac， Copt．，De W．，Neand．，and apparently the bulk of modern expositors，and seems most in harmony with the context ：the apostle rivas laid hold on by Christ（at his conversion，IIorsley，Serm．xvir．，not necessarily as a fugitive in a race，Clırys．， Hamm．）with ref．to that，－to enable him to obtain that，which he was now striv－
ing to lay hold of．It may be observed lastly that $\kappa$ al does not refer to a suppressed ধ̇ $\gamma \dot{\omega}$ ，nor to $\kappa \alpha т є \lambda$ ．（Alf．）， but to the preceding relative，which it specifies，and tacitly contrasts with other ends which inight be conceivable；＇for which，too，for which very salvation，I was apprehended，＇etc．；comp．I Cor． xiii．12，ка⿰訁̀̀s кal é $\pi \epsilon \gamma \nu \dot{\omega} \sigma \hat{\eta} \nu$ ，and sce Kilotz，Devar：${ }^{-}$Vol．11．p． 636.

13．$\vec{\alpha} \delta \in \lambda \phi \circ$ ！$]$ Earnest and emphatic repetition of the preceding statements， ander somewhat hortatory aspects，neg－ ative and positive ：in the first portion of the verse the apostle disavows all self－ esteem and self－confidence，－not perhaps without reference to some of his converts （таûтa $\pi \rho \partial े s ~ \tau o u ̀ s ~ \mu \epsilon \gamma a \lambda 0 ф \rho o \nu o u ̂ \nu \tau a s ~ e ̀ \pi \grave{\imath}$
 in the second portion and rerse 14 he declares the persistence and energy of his onward endeavor；évós єi $\mu \mathrm{\mu}$ ubvou，
 ＇ं $\mu a v \tau \delta \nu$ oủ $\lambda o \gamma$ ！ऽ．к．т．$\lambda$.$] ＇do not$ esteem MYSELF to have apprehended：＇ the juxtaposition of eje and the spec－ ially added ${ }^{\prime} \mu \alpha u \tau \grave{\partial} \nu$（see Winer；Gram． §44．3，p．287）not only mark the self－ ish clement which the apostle disavows （Mey．），but declare his own deliberate judgrent on his own case ；comp．Beng． The verb doyitouat is rather a favorite word with St．Paul，being used（exclud－ ing quotations）twenty－nine times in his Epp．，and twice only（Mark xi． 31 is very doubtful）in the rest of the N．T．

14．ह̂̀ $\nu \delta \epsilon \in]$＇but one thing I do，＇scil． $\pi o \omega \hat{\omega}$ ，the general verb in the first clause being inferred from the special verb that follows；see Winer，Gr．§ 66．1．b，j． 546：The ellipsis is variously supplied （ $\rho \iota \mu \nu \hat{\omega}$, © Ecumen． 2 ；̇̇ $\sigma \tau$ l，Beza；$\delta \iota \omega ́ k \omega$ ， Flatt），evaded（Gothic），passed over （Nethiopic），or left nakedly as it stands


14. èmi] So Rec., Griesb., with DEFGKL; majority of mss.; Chrys., Theod. On the other: hand, Lachm, and Tisch. read eis with AB ; 17. 73. S0; Clem., Ath., al. (Mey., Alf.), apparently on the gromed of $\dot{e \pi} \boldsymbol{\lambda}$ being an interpretation of the eis of 'destination.' $\Lambda$ s it can scarcely be said that érí, especially with the meming' anciently assigned to Bpaß. (e. g. Theod.), is a much easier expression than eis, it does not here seem safe to reject the reading of so many uncial MSS.
(Vulg., Copt.). The most simple and natural supplement is that adopted above, as Theoph., Cecum., and most modern expositors ; see Jelf, Gr. § 895. c. Meyer strongly urges the participial form $\pi o t \omega \hat{\nu}$, but this surely mars the emphasis, and obscures the prominent $\delta \iota \omega \kappa \omega$, to which the ellipsis seems intended to direct attention. $\tau \grave{\alpha} \mu \grave{\epsilon} \nu$ oं $\pi i \sigma \omega$ '̇ $\pi เ \lambda$.] 'forgetting the things behind;' not the renounced Judaical prerogatives, ver. 5 sq . (Vorst.), nor the deeds done under their influence, but, as the metaphor almost unmistakably suggests, the portions of his Christian course already traversed, 'the things attained and left behind,' Fell ; $\hat{\epsilon} \nu$ тоьิ,


 aủcêv, Theoph.; compare Chrys. The special reference of Theod. to oî $\pi \epsilon \rho \grave{\imath}$ тoû кทри́ชиaтos $\pi \dot{v} \nu o l$ is unsatisfactory, as obscuring the general and practical teaching which this vital passage conveys;

 Chrys.

In the verb eiminavง. (middle, - of the inward act, Scheuerl. Synt. p. 295 ; act. non occ.) the preposition seems to mark the application of the action to, and perhaps also its extending over (accus.) the object, a little more forcibly than the simplo verb ( $\lambda \eta$ ทָ? ? $\pi \alpha-$ paīoûval, Chrys.) ; comp. Rost. u. Palm, Lex. s. v. è $\pi \ell$, C. ce, dd. It is occasionally, as here, found with the accus. ; the simple form always with gen.; compare

Jelf, $G r . \S 512$, Thom. M. p. 348 (cd. Bern.), $\tau o$ is $\delta \grave{\epsilon}$ モ̌ $\mu \pi \rho$ o $\sigma$ $\mathcal{N} \in \nu$ दे $\pi \in \kappa \tau$.] 'but stretching out after the things that are in front:' more clistinct emergence of the imagre of the
 (to use tho language of Chrys.) which are yet to be passed over in the Christian course, and are the successive objects (dat, of direction, seo Hartung, C C sus, p. 83) toward which the action of the é $\pi \epsilon \kappa \tau \epsilon \iota \nu$. is directed: good works done in faith are the successive strides; Andrewes, Scrm. Vol. iII. p. 95 (A.-C. Libr.). In the double compound $\epsilon \pi \in \kappa \tau$. the $\epsilon \pi l$ marks the direction, è $\kappa$ the posture, in which the racer stretches out his body toward the oljects before him ; $\delta$

 $\pi \rho o \lambda a \beta \in i ̂ \nu ~ \sigma \pi o u \delta \alpha ́ \zeta \omega \nu$, Chrys. A very similar use of é $\pi \epsilon \kappa \tau \epsilon i \nu \in \sigma$ aral is citcd in Steph. Thesaur. s. v., Strabo, Xvir. p. 800. $\kappa \alpha \tau$ à $\sigma \kappa o \pi \grave{\partial} \nu$ $\delta \iota \omega \kappa \omega]$ ' I press forward toward the marrl.' The preposition кarà here marks the direction of the $\delta$ oẃke $\nu$ (see Acts viii, 26 , xvi. 7 , and with more geographical reference, ii. 10, xxvii. 12), a direction which, according to the primary meaning of the prep. (катà $=\kappa \kappa-\nu$ $-\tau a$ ) is represented 'beginning near' us and procceding to a point not necessarily distant,' Donalds. Cratyl. § 183. On the absolute use of $\delta \iota \omega \kappa \kappa \omega$, sce on ver. 12. $\beta \rho \alpha \beta$. $\tau \hat{\eta} s$ 垙 $\nu \omega \kappa \lambda \dot{n} \sigma \in \omega s$ ] 'prize of the heavenly calling;' the gen. not being of apposition (De W.), which would

## 

involve the untenable assumption that $\kappa \lambda \hat{\eta} \sigma \iota s=$ 'superna beatitudo,' Est., compare De W., - but a species of the gen. possessivus, serving to mark the $\beta$ pa $\beta$. as that which the $\alpha, \nu \omega$ cл $\lambda \bar{\eta} \sigma t s$ has in expectation as its final crown. The $\beta p a \beta \in i o y$ is here, as in I Corinth. ix. 24, not ' the
 Theod.), and is the object which the $\delta$ tw$\kappa \in \omega \nu$ is designed to attain (compare Luke xv. 14, xxii. 52, Acts viii. 36, and sec critical note), - 'the future cternal glory to which God calls us by the gospel of Christ,' Bull, Serm. xiv. p. 268 (Oxf. 1844). The derivation is uncertain; perhaps $\beta \rho a=\pi \rho o$ with reference to the judge sitting forward to award the prize. Benfey, Wurzellex. Vol. II. 1). 106.
The кл $\hat{\eta} \sigma \iota s$, here defined as proceeding from God (gen. originis), is still further
 calling (compare Col. iii. 2, Gal. iv. 26) ; not with any special reference to the peculiar appointment of St. Paul (Meyer, Alf.), but, as the latitude of the passage seems to require, with general reference to its ends and objects; it was a к $\kappa$ रो $\bar{\imath}$ ts émoupávos (Heb. iii. 1). God was its author (1 Thess. ii. 12), heaven the object to which it conducted, and in reference to which it was vouchsafed; compare ver. 20. $\quad \underset{~}{\nu} \nu \mathrm{X} p$. 'I $\eta \sigma$. may be connected (a) with $\delta$ เ $\omega$ кco, as Chrys., appy. Theoph., EEcum., and very emphatically Mcyer ; or (b) with $\kappa \lambda \hat{\eta} \sigma \iota s$ (Copt.,
 ev $\nu \mathrm{X} \rho$. without the art. being a permissible formula ; see Winer, Gram. § 20. 2, p. 123, and notes on Eph. i: 15. The latter seems most simple, and most coincident with St. Paul's use of the formula.
On the dogmatical significance of this verse, as indicating an effort on our parts through the assistance of grace, compare Reuss, Theol. Chrét. Iv. 22. Vol. in. p. 255.
15. $8 \sigma 0$ \& o $\bar{v} \nu$ ] 'As mamy then as;' the oũ̀ with its usual collective and retrospective force gathering into a definite exhortation the statements made in the three preceding verses : compare IKlotz, Devar. Vol. II. p. 717. ${ }^{\circ}$ Oбor is clearly not synonymous with inkeis o\%, Heinr., but is designedly used as leaving to each one's conscience whether he were $\tau$ t́lelos or no. тє́ $\lambda \in L 0$ 6] 'perfect;'
 12), but relatively ; - yet not necessarily as opposed to $\nu$ mitoo, 'in socictate Christianâ cum adultis comparandi,' Van Heng. (compare 1 Cor. ii. 6, xiv. 20, where, however, the reference seems more to knowledge), but simply as those who had made some advance toward the ténos of Christian lifo; compare Wiesinger in loc., where this view is elaborately and successfully maintained.
$\tau 0 \hat{v} \tau 0 \phi \rho \circ \nu \hat{\omega} \mu \in \nu$ ] 'let us be of this mind,' ' let us entertain these views with regard to religious practice (Horsley), which I follow, and which I am here inculcating.' Yet what views? Surely

 its fullest sense is to consist in $\tau \delta \mu \grave{\eta} \nu_{0-}$
 ophyl.), but with a more inclusive reference to the whole great sulject which commenced ver. 7 , was continued to ver. 12 , and was specially illustrated in ver. 12-14. That the roûto does refer to what immediately precedes, to the $\hat{\varepsilon} \nu \delta \frac{1}{\xi}$ of ver. 13 , seems required by the rules of perspicuity, - but, that it refers to it only in so far as it forms a sort of example and special statement of the modus agendi, in reference to ver. 8 sq ., seems required by the evident interdependence of tho whole passage. $k$ al є亡 т८ к. r. $\lambda$.$] 'and if in any respect ye$ are differently minded ;' 'if you entertain, as is certainly supposable ( $\epsilon i$ with indic.,

##  

see Winer，Gr．§41．2，notes on Gal．i． 9 ），upon any point，－not of doctrine or extemal worship（Horsley），but of moral
 d̀入入̀े $\pi \epsilon \rho \grave{\text { Biou } \tau \in \lambda \epsilon t o ́ \tau \eta \tau o s, ~ C h r y s .), ~ a n y ~}$ different，and so，almost necessarily，less correct sentiments，even this too，－this about which ye are thus differently minded，will God reveal to you in its true relations．＇There is thus no need with Horsley，in his able sermon on this
 references，（a）to religious disposition， （b）to opinion；nor is it enough to regard غ́ $\tau$ épos as merely in opposition to＇same－ ress and uniformity；＇when the context seems so clearly to imply an improper and injurious diversity ；sec examples of this sense of ${ }^{\text {Ë }} \tau \in p o s$ in notes on Gal．i． 6. We may observe（with Wiesinger）that
 pws ；they did not difier in fundamentals， but in the aspects and relations in which they regarded them and carried them into practice．$\kappa \alpha l \tau \circ \hat{\tau} \tau$ o］ ＇even this，＇＇this also，as well as the other things which God has been pleased to reveal；＇the ascensive kal contrasting the present roûto，－the point on which they need revelation，not with the pre－ ceding тoùro（Flatt），but with the other points（to which $\epsilon \check{\imath} \tau \iota$ is the exception） concerning which they have already re－ ceived it，and are already in accord with the apostle：compare Hartung，Partik． S．v．kal，2．8，Vol．ı．p．135．The toûто is somewhat differently explained，＇jus－ titiam esse ex fide，＇Vatabl．，＇vos esse deceptos，＇Grot．，＇quod nos perfecti＇sen－ timus，＇Beng．；alii alia．The only nat－ ural explanation seems that adopted above，viz．，the thing concerning which
 relations of the preceding $\tau\},{ }^{\text {＇}} \tau$ i in sei－ ner wahrheit，＇De Wette；$\delta$ Oès vi $\mu$ iv
 $\dot{\alpha} \pi$ ока入 $\dot{v} \Psi^{\prime} \in \ell$ ］＇will reveal，＇by means of the $\Pi \nu \in \bar{\nu} \mu \alpha, ~ \sigma o ф i a s ~ к а l ~ a ̀ \pi о к а \lambda \dot{1} \psi \epsilon \omega s$ ，
 a入í $\psi \in l$ iva $\delta \delta \xi \xi \eta$ ク $\mu a ̄ \lambda \lambda o \nu$ ả $\gamma \nu o i ́ a s ~ \epsilon i v a l ~ \tau \delta ~$ $\pi \rho \hat{a} \gamma \mu a$, Chrys．The future is not merely expressive of wish，but of an assured and predictive hope；＇loquitur pro spe quam ex priore ipsorum fide conceperat ；sic et Gal．v．10，＇Grot．：comp．Winer，Gr． §40．6，p． 251.

16．$\pi \lambda$ ท́ $\nu$ ］＇Notwithstanding，＇＇be that as it may，＇Horsley；＇in spite of there being several points in which you will probably need àmoká $\lambda u \psi \iota s . '$ ．The practically adversative force of $\pi \lambda \eta \nu$ lim． its the proceding expression of predic－ tive hope，while its intrinsically compar－ ative force serves also to contrast the aor． ＇́ $\phi$ ה．with the fut．àmoк．；see notes on ch．i．18，and Klotz，Devar．Vol．II．p． 724．$\quad \epsilon$ is $\delta \hat{\epsilon} \phi \hat{N} \alpha \dot{\alpha} \sigma \mu \in \nu]$ ＇whereto we have attained，＇Matth．xii． 28，Rom．ix．31，compare Luko xi． 20. The primary and classical meaning of this verb（preevenire）appears to have been almost entirely lost sight of in Al－ exandrian Greek，and to have merged in the general meaning＇venirc，＇and with eis，＇pervenire ；＇compare Dan．iv．

 Yol．11．p． 357.

It is doubtful whether $\dot{\epsilon} \phi$ Ń̦d́ $\sigma$ ．denotes advance in moral conduct（Chrys．，Theophyl．，Mcy．），ad－ vance in knowledge（De W．，Wiesing．）， or in both（Alf．）；the first seems most in accordance with the context and with $\sigma$ Toı $\chi \in i v$ ，the last，however，not improba－ ble．Lastly，that $\hat{o}$ does not indicate a point common to all，is almost self－evi－ dent：it is a point，in a common line，va－ rying in its position according to indi－ vidual progress．This common line （produced）the apostle，in the following

Iniitate me and my follow－ ers，for many，alas I mind carthly things．Our coun－ try is heaven，whence we look for our Lord and our final change．



words，commands all to pursue，and not to diverge from ：compare the illustra－ tive diagram of Meyer in loc．
$\tau \hat{\psi} \alpha \dot{v} \tau \hat{\omega} \sigma \tau 0 \leqslant \chi \in \hat{\imath} \nu]$＇＇walk onzard coincidently with the same，＇or＇according to the same；＇dat．normce，compare Gal． vi．16，$\tau \hat{\varphi}$ каvóvı тoú $\underset{\sim}{\omega}$ бтol $\chi \in i v$ ，where see note and references．The infinitive is here imperatival，and in accordance with that usage，conveys a precise and emphatic command，or rather address （Krüger，Sprachl．§ 55.1 .5 ），in the sec－ ond person singular or plural ；sce Jelf， Gr．671．a，Fritz．Rom．Vol．III．p． 86. Hence the hortative translation in the first person；as in Theoph．，бтоเх⿳⺈ $\mu \in \nu$ （comp．Chrys．），and in all the Vv．ex－ cept AEth．（Platt），seems grammatically doubtful ；so rightly Mey．，Alf．，but not De W．This is perhaps the only certain instance of a pure imperatival infinitive in the N．T．；other instances，e．g．Rom． xii． 15 ，pass more into declarations or duty and of what ought to be done，and may consequently，be joined with all three persons ；sec Jelf，Gram．§ 671．b， Winer，Gr．§ 43．5，p． 283. The addition in Rece．，каvóvı，тो aủz $\phi$ фpoveiv， which appears，with variations both of words and order，in the majority of un－ cial MSS（sce Tische），is rejected by AB；17．67米媇；Copt．，Sah．，Rth．（Pol．， but not Platt），Theodot．－Ancyr．；Hil．， Aug．，al．，and by Luclım．，Tisch．，and most recent editors．It has been de－ fended by Rinck，Matth．，and Wordsw．， but，owing to the suspicious variations in words and order，has overy appear－ ance of an explanatory gloss ；comp．ch． ii．2，Gal．vi． 16.
17．$\sigma v \mu \mu \iota \mu \eta \tau \alpha\}$ к．т．$\lambda_{\text {．}}$＇Be imi－ tators together，scil．with all who imitate me；＇＇coimitatores，＇Clarom．，Copt．：
continuation of the foregoing exhortation with reference to the apostle＇s own ex－ ample．The $\sigma \dot{v} \nu$ in $\sigma v \mu \mu$ ．is apparently neither otiose on the one hand，as in ouvtoגîtal，Ephes．ii．19，nor yet on the other docs it imply so much as＇omnes uno consensu，et unâ mente，＇Calv．，Al－ ford，－a tinge of ethical meaning not suggested or required by the context．It appears simply to mark the common na－ ture of the action in which they all were to share；not merely＇be imitators＇（1 Cor．iv．16），but＇be a company of such；＇

入oımoús，Chrys．каl $\sigma \kappa o \pi \in \hat{i} \tau \epsilon$ к．$\tau . \lambda$.$] ＇and mark them$ which are thus walling；＇they were all to imitate the absent apostle and to observe studiously those with them who walked after his example．Who theso were can－ not be determined：the reference may be to Timothy，Epaphras，and other mis－ sionaries of the apostle，but is perhaps more naturally to all those，whether holy men among the Philippians，or teachers sent to them，who followed the example
 тоûठє tô̂ бкожо仑̂ koıvavoús，Theod． $\kappa \alpha$ जें $s$ ह̌ $\chi \in \tau \in \kappa . \tau . \lambda$.$] ＇as ye have$ us for an ensample，＇ка⿱亠乂禸小 standing in correlation to the preceding oí $\mathbf{T}$ co，and $\dot{\eta} \mu a ̂ s$ referring to the apostle ：so Vulg．， Clarom．，and all Vr．，Chrys．and the Greek expositors，and，it may be added， nearly all modern commentators．Meyer and Wiesing．give kaviss an argumenta－ tive force，＇inasmuch as＇（see notes on Eph．i．4），but in so doing seem to im－ pair the force，and obscure the perspi－ cuity of the passage ：see AIf．in loc．，who has satisfactorily refuted this interpreta． tion．The use of the plural $\eta$ juâs does


not imply a reference to St．Paul and тoùs oütcos $\pi \epsilon \rho เ \pi$ ．，but seems naturally to point cither to the apostle and his fellow－ workers（Van Heng．，Alf．），or perhaps， more probably，is the apostle＇s designa－ tion of himself viewed less in his per－ sonal than his official relations：＇be all， in matters of practical religion，imitators of me，Paul，and observe those，etc．，who have me their apostle as their ensample；＇ compare 2 Thess．iii．7，9．The singu－ lar đútov yields no support to either in－ terpretation；see Bernhardy，Synt．II．5， p． 61.
18．$\pi \circ \lambda \lambda 01 \gamma \alpha \rho]$ Reason for the foregoing exhortation arising from the sad nature of the case．Who the mo八入ol were cannot be exactly determined．It seems，however，clear that they are not the same as those mentioned in ver． 2 sq ．The latter were false teachers，and of Judaical tenets；these，on the con－ trary，were not teachers at all，and were of an Epicurean bias；not，however，Pa－ gans（Rill．），but nominal Christians， baptized sinners（Manning），who dis－ graced their profession by their sensual－

 after Chrys．$\quad \pi \in \rho \iota \pi \alpha \tau$ o $\hat{v}$－ $\sigma \iota \nu]$＇are walking，＇＇are pursuing their course．＇There is no need to supply any qualifying adverb $(\Delta)$ ［aliter］Syr．），or to assume any pause and change of structure（Rill．，De W．）． Though commonly associated by St．Paul with qualifying adverbs or adv．clauses， whether in bonam（Rom．xiii．13，Eph．iv． 1），or in malam partem（2 Cor．iv．2， 2 Thess．iii．6），the verb itself is of neutral meaning（comp． 1 Thess．iv．1），and in its metaphorical use seems only to de－ signate a man＇s course of life in its prac－ tical aspects and manifestations；it being
left to the context to decide whether they are bad or good．
$\pi \circ \lambda \lambda \alpha \kappa \iota s$ €゙ $\lambda \in \gamma \circ \nu$ ］＇oftimes used to mention to you ；＇most probably by word of mouth ；perhaps also in the messages transmitted to them by his emissaries； not by any means necessarily in another Epistle（Flatt）．The $\pi 0 \lambda \lambda$ d́кıs（＇many times＇）follows the $\pi 0 \lambda \lambda 0$ o with a slight rhetorical force not without example in St．Paul＇s Epistles ；see Winer，Gr．§ 68. 1，p． 560 ，and compare the large quan－ tity of examples collected by Lobeck， Paralipom．p．56， 57.
$\kappa \alpha) \kappa \lambda \alpha\{\omega \nu]$＇even weeping，＇because



 סéva тoıoûyral 入óyov，Chrys．
Toùs Ě $\chi$ रे poìs $\tau \circ \hat{\nu} \sigma \tau \alpha v p o \hat{v}]$＇the （special）enemies of the cross ：＇apposition to the preceding relative ；compare Wi－ ner，Gr．§59．7，p．469．The article de－ fines the class sharply and distinctly，
 They are so specified，not on account of their doctrinal errors（ $\delta \iota \delta \dot{\alpha} \sigma \kappa o \nu \tau \alpha s$ öt
 $\sigma \omega \tau \eta \rho i a s ~ \tau v \chi \in i v$ ，Theod．），but on account of their sensuality and their practical de－ nial of the great Christian principle，of

 v．24．So Chrys．，Theoph．，Ecumen．， and，with a more general ref．，Athan．（？） de Virgin．§ 14．On the practical ap－ plication of the verse，＇the Cross the measure of sin，＇see Manning，Serm．XI． Vol．III．p． 201 sq．，and compare Bp． Hall，Serm．xir．Vol．v．p． 172 sq．（Oxf． 1837）．

19．$\tilde{\omega} \nu \tau \delta \tau \epsilon \in \lambda$ os $\dot{\alpha} \pi \dot{\omega} \lambda \in เ a]$ ．＇whose end is perdition ；＇more specific descrip－ tion of their characteristics，and the cer－

tain and fearful issues that await them. Té ${ }^{\prime}$ os has the article as marking the definite and almost necessary end of such a course (compare 2 Cor. xi. 15), while $\dot{\alpha} \pi \dot{\omega} \lambda \epsilon \iota a$ manks that end as no merely temporal one, but, as its usage in St. Paul's Epp. (ch. i. 28, Rom. ix. 22, 2 Thess. ii. 3, 1 Tim. vi. 9) seems always to indicate, - as eternal ; compare Fritz. Tiomans, Vol. 11. p. 338, and contrast Rom. vi. $22 . \quad$ © $\nu \delta \Theta \in \delta s$ ] ' whose God is their belly: ' comp. Rom.

 That this peculiarly characterizes these sensualists as Jews (sec Theod.), and espec. Pharisces (Schocttg. Hor. Hebr. Vol. r. p. 801), does not seem tenable; seo on ver. 18. Several commentators, B. Crus., Alf. (comp. Vulg., Theoph.), regard $\delta$ ©eds as the predicate; the following clause seems to suggest the contrary.

каl $\dot{\eta} \delta \delta o ́ \xi \alpha$ к. $\tau . \lambda$.$] 'and (whose) glory is in their$ shame,' scil. 'exists in the sphere of it,' ' versatur in,' not 'becomes their shame,' Luther ; clause dependent on the preceding $\tilde{\omega} \nu$. The $\delta \delta \hat{\xi} \alpha$ is here, as Mcyer rimhtly suggests, subjective, what they deemed so ; air $\chi$ v́ $\nu \eta$, on the contrary, is objective, what every moral consideration marked to be so. The reference of aif$\chi$ v́vŋ to circumcision (' quorum gloria in judendis,' Aug., Pseudo.-Ambr., Ansclm), probably surgested by the confusion of those here mentioned with those noticed in rerse 2 , is alluded to, but rightly not adopted by Chrys. and Theoph.
oi $\tau \grave{\alpha}$ ध́ $\pi$ i $\gamma$. $\phi \rho o-$ vo ̂̀v $\in s$ ] 'who mind earthly things:' relapse into the nominative to give the clause force and emphasis; sce Bernhardy, Synt. III. 3, p. 68. This can scarcely be called so much a participial anacoluthon (see examples in Winer, Gr. § 63. 2, p. 505), as an emphatic re-
turn to the primary construction, $\pi 0 \lambda \lambda 0$ o үà $\rho \pi \epsilon \rho i \pi$.- oi $\tau \grave{\alpha}$ è $\pi i \gamma \epsilon L a$ фроעоûעтєs. The tvord $\varphi p o v \in i v$, as Horslcy has remarked (on ver. 15), has considerable amplitude of meaning : combined with $\tau \alpha े ~ e ̀ \pi i \gamma \epsilon t a$ (contrast ver. 20) it here seems to denote the concentration of all thought, feeling, and interest in carth and earthliness, -rò
 gives special cxx. ; comp. Alf. in loc.
20. $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \gamma \grave{\alpha} \rho \tau \delta \pi o \lambda$.] 'For OUR country or commonwealth is in heaven;' confirmation (' enim,' Clarom., not 'autem,' Vulg.) of the foregoing by means of the contrasted conduct of St. Paul and his followers (ver. 17), $\hat{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ being emphatic, and $\pi 0 \lambda$. èv ouvp. in antithesis to $\tau \grave{a}$ énily. фрoveîv. The word mo $i \tau \epsilon \nu \mu a$, an $\dot{\alpha} \pi$. $\lambda \in \gamma \delta \mu$. in the N. T., has received scveral different explanations. Three deserve consideration ; (c) conversution;
'conversatio,' Vulg., Syr., 'vita civilis,' Copt., and as far as we can infer, Theodoret, Cecumenius, -the meaning being, ' nostra quam hic sequamur vivendi ratio in coelis est,' Van Heng., De Wette ; $(\beta)$ citizenship, 'municipatus,' Jerome (comp. Tertull. de Cor. Mill. § 13), 'jus civitatis nostræ,' Zanch, Luther (earlier ed.), - the meaning being, 'we are freedmen of a heavenly city,' Whichcote, Sern. xviII. Vol. II. p. 375, and more recently Manning, Serm. x. Vol. III. p. $183 ;(\gamma)$ country, state, to which we belong as moגital; Sanderson, Scrm. xv. Vol. I. p. 378 (cd. Jacobs.) ; see 2 Macc. xii. 7, т $\omega \hat{\nu}$
 $12, \tau \alpha ̀ \pi 0 \lambda เ \tau \epsilon \cup ́ \mu \alpha \tau \alpha$. [ $\tau \bar{\omega} \nu$ ' $\mathrm{P} \omega \mu . \kappa$. K $\alpha \rho \chi$.], and compare Eph. ii. 19, бvขтo入îtaь $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ á $\gamma^{\prime} \omega \nu$; so Theophl. ( $\tau \grave{\nu} \pi a \tau \rho i \delta \alpha$ ), Beng., Mey., Alf., and the majority of modern commentators. Of these ( $\kappa$ ) has this advantage, that being subjective it presents a more exact contrast to $\tau$ à $\bar{\epsilon} \pi i \gamma$.



фpoveiv; the equiv., however, to d̀vaбrpoфो rests only on the use of the verb (comp. Philo, de Confus. § $17, \chi$ đ̂pov ¿̀v $\widehat{\varphi}$ тo৯ıтévovtau), and is itself not lexically demonstrable. Again in ( $\beta$ ) the equivalence of $\pi о \lambda i \tau \epsilon \nu \mu a$ to $\pi$ толгтeía (Acts xxii. 28) is equally doubtful, for the passage adduced from Aristot. Pol. iri. 6, does not prove that the words are used indifferently (Alf.), but indifferently only in regard to a particular sense ( $\pi \delta \delta$ रeces $\tau \alpha \dot{\alpha}(s)$, a a statement fully confirmed by other passages, Polyb. Hist. iv. 23. 9, al., Joseph. contr. Ap. II. 17, - a pertinent example; compare Beza in loc. We retain then $(\gamma)$, which appears to yield a pertinent meaning, and was perhaps chosen rather than $\pi$ ódıs (Heb. xi. 10), or $\pi a \tau p$ is (Heb. xi. 14), as representing our heavenly home, our 'Iepoura$\lambda \grave{\eta} \mu$ étovpávos (Heb. xii. 22), on the side of its constitution and polity; ' our state, the spiritual constitution to which we belong is in heaven:' compare Gal. iv. 26, Rev. xxi. 2, 10, Usteri, Lelrob. 11. 1. 2, p. 182.

द̀v oủpavoìs vid $\rho \mathrm{f}$.] 'existeth in heaven,' 'constituta est,' Clarom. ; sce Wordsw. in loc., who rightly calls attention to the strong word ímápXet. The various practical aspects of this consolatory declaration are ably stated by Whichcote, Serm. xviri., though somewhat modified by the interpretation assigned to тол $\langle\tau \epsilon \nu \mu \alpha$ : our home is in heaven white we are here below, exemplariter, as we make it our copy; finaliter, as we carry it in our thoughts; unalogice, in regard to the quality of ouractions; inchoative, according to the degreo of our present station ; intellectualiter, according to the constitution of our minds; Vol. 11. p. 375 sq. è $\xi$ oi] 'from whence,' 'inde,' Vulgate

scil. тòır. (Beng.), a construction permissible, but not necessary, as $\bar{\xi} \xi$ ỗ is purely adverbial; see Winer, Gr. $\$ 21$. $3, p .128$. The meaning 'ex quo tempore,' is grammatically correct (Kruiger, Sprachl. §43. 4. 7) but obviously pointless and unsatisfactory.
$\kappa a l . \sigma \omega \tau . \dot{a} \pi \in \kappa \delta$.] 'we also tarry for as Saviour;' the kal marks the correspondence of the act with the previous declaration, $\sigma \omega T \hat{n} \rho a$ the capacity in which the Lord was tarried for. The pure ethical meaning of à äєкठ. sc. 'constanter, patienter, expectare' (Tittm. Synon. I. p. 106), seems here, owing to the preceding $\mathfrak{\varepsilon} \xi$ o $\mathbb{U}$, less distinct than in other passages where such local allusions are not present, e. g., Rom. viii. 19, 23, 25, 1 Cor. i. 7, Gal. v. 5, 1 Pet. iii. 20, but is perhaps not wholly lost: see notes on Gal. v. 5, Winer, de Verb. Comp. 1v. p. 14, Fritz. Fritzsch. Opusc. p. 156 ; compare also notes on ch. i. 20 . The simple form ékóé $\chi \in \sigma \geqslant \alpha a$ occurs 1 Cor. xvi. 11, James v. 7 ; comp. Soph. Phil. 123, Dion.-Hal. Antiq. vr. 67.
21. $\mu \in \tau a \sigma \chi \eta \mu a \tau[\sigma \in L]$ 'shall transform,' simply ; - not 'verklären,' Luth., Neand., a meaning derived only from the context. This peculiar exhibition of our Lord's power at His second coming is brought here into prominence, to enhance the condemnation of sensuality (ver. 19) and to confirm the indirect exhortation to a pure though suffering life. It seems wholly unnecessary to restrict this merely to the living (Mey.); still less can we say with Alf. that the words assume, as St. Paul always does when speaking incidentally, the $\dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon$ is surviving to witness the coming of the Lord,' when really every moment of a true Christian's life involves such an à $\pi \in \kappa \delta o \chi$ ív. On tho nature of this $\mu \epsilon \tau \alpha \sigma \chi \eta \mu a \tau \iota \sigma \mu \delta \delta^{\prime}$, which the following words define to be strictly

 тávta.
in accordance with that of the Lord's body, - a change from a natural to a spiritual body (1 Cor. xv. 44), compare Burnet, State of Dead, ch. viri. p. 231 (Transl.), Cudworth, Intell. Syst. v. 3, Vol. 1II. p. 310 sq. (Tegg), Delitzsch, Psychol. ini. 1, p. 401 sq ., and the comments of Wordsw. in loc.
$\tau \delta \sigma \hat{\omega} \mu \alpha \kappa . \tau . \lambda$.] 'the body of our humiliation; " not 'our vile body;' Auth. Ver., Conyb., a solution of the genitive case which though in some cases admissible (Winer, Gr. § 34. 3. b, p. 211) here obscures the full meaning of the words and mars the antithesis. The gen. seems here not so much a gen. of quality as of content, and to belong to the general category of the genitive materice (Schenerl. Synt. § 12. 2. p. 83) ; the тaтeivoणts was that which the $\sigma \bar{\omega} \mu \alpha$ contained and involved, that of which it was the receptacle; compare Bernh. Synt. iII. 45, p. 63. It seem's undesirable with Chrys. (comp. Mey., Alf.) to refer $\tau a \pi \epsilon$ iv $\omega \sigma i s$ wholly to the sufferings of the body, 'humil. que fit per crucem.' Though the more remote context (comp. ver. 18) shows that these must clearly be included, the more immediate antithesis $\tau \delta \quad \sigma \omega \hat{\mu} \mu \tau \hat{\eta} s \delta \delta \xi \eta s$ seems also to show that the ideas of weakness and fleshly nature (Coloss. i. 22) must not be excluded ; compare Fritz. Rom. vi. 6, Vol. 1. p. 382. The distinction between $\tau \alpha$ $\pi \epsilon i \nu \omega \sigma \iota s$ and $\tau a \pi \epsilon \iota \nu \dot{\sigma} \eta \eta s$ (compare Alf.) cannot safely be pressed ; see Luke i. 48, Prov. xvi. 19 al. For examples of a similar connection of the pronoun with the dependent subst., see Green, $G r$. p. 265. $\sigma u ́ \mu \mu o \rho \phi o \nu$ к. $\tau . \lambda]$ ' (so as to be) conformed to the body of His
 gloss which Rec. with $\mathrm{D}^{2} \mathrm{D}^{3} \mathrm{EKL}$; many .Vv.; Orig., al., retain as a portion of
the text. The shorter reading has not only internal, but preponderant external evidence $\left[\mathrm{ABD}^{1} \mathrm{FG}\right.$; Vulg., Clarom., Guth., al.] distinctly in its favor. On this proleptic use of the adj., see Winer, Gr. §66. 3, p. 550, Jelf, Giam. § 439. 2. The genitival relation $\tau \hat{\eta} s \delta o ̂ \xi \eta s$ aủrồ is exactly similar to that of $\tau \hat{\eta} s \tau \alpha \pi$. $\dot{\eta} \mu$., 'the body which is the receptacle of His glory, in which His glory is manifested.' In respect of this $\delta \delta \xi \neq$ we are $\sigma \dot{v} \mu \mu \circ \rho \phi o<$,
 тоь́т $\eta$ та, Theod.
$\kappa \propto \tau$ $\tau \eta \nu$ E' $^{\prime}$ '́ $\rho \gamma$.] 'according to the worling of His ability,' etc. ; compare Eph. i. 19. The object of this clause, as Calvin rightly remarks, is to remove every possible doubt; 'ad infinitam Dei potentiam convertere oportet, ut ipsa omnem dubitationem absorbeat. Nec potentix tantum meminit, sed efficaciæ, quæ est effectus vel potentia in actum se exscrens.' The infin. with $\tau 0 v$ is dependent on the preceding subst. as a simple (possessive) gen. (a construction very common in the N. T.), and serves here to express, perhaps a little more forcibly than $\delta \dot{v} v a \mu s$, the enduring nature and latitude of that power; see examples in Winer, Gr. § 44.4, p. 290.
кal vimo $\left.\alpha, \xi a_{l}\right]$ ' even to subdue;' the ascensive kal scrves to mark the limitless nature of that power : He shall not only transform $\tau \delta \delta \omega \bar{\omega} \mu a \kappa$ к. т. $\lambda$., but shall also subilue $\tau \grave{\alpha} \pi \alpha ́ \nu \tau \alpha$, all existing things, Death not excluded (1 Cor. xv. 26), to Himself. The Kvptórns of the Eternal Son will then be complete, supreme, and universal ; to be resigned unto the Father ( 1 Cor. xv .28 ) in so far as it is economical, to last for eveer and for ever in so far as it is 'consequent unto the union, or due unto the obedience of the passion,' Pearson, Creed, Art. II. Vol. 1. p. 197

Brethren, stand fast in the Lord.

 титои́.
Let Euodia and Syntyche be of one mind: assist, 0 yokefellow, the faithful women.
(ed. Burt.). On the use of $a \hat{\tau} \tau \bar{\omega}[\mathrm{AB}$ D1FG], not éavtê (Rec.), comp. notes on Eph. i. 4.

Chapter IV. 1. $\omega \sigma \tau \epsilon$ ] 'So then,' ' Consequently,' 'itaque,' Vulg.; ' as we have such a heavenly home, and tarry for such a salvation:' concluding exhortation naturally flowing from the preceding paragraph, cli. iii. 17-21, and continued in the same tones of personal entreaty ( $\dot{\alpha} \bar{\delta} \in \lambda \phi o{ }^{\prime}$ ) ; comp. 1 Cor. xv. 58 , where the particle similarly refers to what has immediately preceded. De Wette and Wiesinger refer the particle to ch. iii. 2 sq ., but thereby deprive the exhortation of much of its natural and consecutive force. On the force of |  |
| :---: |
| $\sigma$ |
|  | with indic. and inf., see notes on Gal. ii. 13, and reff., and with the imper., notes on ch. ii. 12.

à $\gamma a \pi \eta \tau$ ol кal ' $\pi / \pi \delta \cdot 2$.] 'beloved and longed after,' - terms by no means synonymous (Heinr.), but marking both the love the apostle entertained for them (emphatically repeated at the end of the paragraph) and the desire he felt te see them; 'carissimi et desideratissimi,' Vulgate. The word is an är. $\lambda \in \gamma \delta \mu$. in the N. T, but is occasionally found elsewhere ; Appian, Hisp. § 43, ėmाтоม่̆тous öpkous (Rost u. Palm, Lex.), Clem.-Rom. 1 Cor.
 On the force of $\mathrm{e} \pi \ell$, see notes on 2 Tim. i. 4.

रapà кal $\sigma \tau$ ध́ $\phi \alpha-$ $\nu$ o's $\mu \mathrm{ov}]$ ' $m y$ joy and crown,' scil. ' $\phi^{\prime}$ ' ois रapà кail ěnauvo éx $\chi$, Camerar. See especially 1 Thess. ii. 19 , in which
 there limit the reference to the Lord's coming, - a reference, however, here
(Alford, comp. Calv.) by no means necessary: the Philippians were a subject of joy and a crown to St. Paul, now as well as hereafter; compare 1 Cor. ix. 2, 3. For examples of this metaphorical use of $\sigma \tau$ ध́ $\phi$., see Isaiah xxviii. 5 , Ecclus. i. 11, xxv. 6, Soph. Ajax, $460^{\circ}$.
oưTws] 'thus,' - as I have exhorted you, and as those are acting whose $\pi 0 \lambda\{$ Tévua is in heaven.' A reference to their present state ('sic ut cœepistis, state,' Schmid., Beng.), though suggested by Chrys., secms out of place in this earnest exthortation: 1 Cor. ix. 24, cited by Bengel, is not in point. $\sigma \tau \dot{\eta} \kappa \in \tau \epsilon$ $\epsilon^{\prime} \nu \mathrm{K} v \rho$.] 'stand ( fast) in the Lord;' not 'per Dominum,' Zanch., but 'in Domino, - in Him as in the true element of their spiritual life; see 1 Thess. iii. 8, and notes on Ephes. iv. 17, vi. 1. al.
2. Eùoठ\{av $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \kappa$.] Special exhortation addressed to two women, Euodia and Syntyche; compare ver. 3. The opinion of Grot. that they are the names of tivo men (Euodias and Syntyches) is untenable ; that of Schwegler (Nachapost. Zeit. Vol. II. p. 135), that they represent two parties in.the Church, monstrous. Of the two persons nothing whatever is known; they may have been deaconesses (Rom. xvi. 1), but were more probably persons of station and influence (Chrys., comp. Acts xvii. 12), whose dissensions, perhaps in matters of
 have shaken the faith (comp. oütws $\sigma \tau \dot{\eta}^{-}$ wets immediately preceding) of some of the Philippian converts. Syntycho has a place in the Acta Sanct. (July) Vol. v. p. 225. таракал $\hat{\omega}$ ] The repetition of this verb is somewhat-no-

кai $\sigma \in ́, ~ \gamma \nu \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma \iota \epsilon \sigma v ́ \nu \zeta v \gamma \epsilon, \sigma v \lambda \lambda a \mu \beta a ́ \nu o v ~ a u ̉ \tau a i ̂ s, ~ a i ̈ \tau \iota \nu \epsilon \varsigma ~ \epsilon ่ \nu ~ \tau o ̀ ~ \epsilon v ̀ a \gamma-~$


ticeable: it scarcely seems 'ad vehementiam affectus significandam,' Erasm., Mey., but rather to mark that they both equally needed the exhortation, that they were in fact both equally to blame. The ${ }_{\epsilon} \nu \mathrm{K} v \dot{\nu}$. is of course not to be joined with тарак., 'obtestor per Dom.,' Beza 2, but marks the sphere in which the тo auved ppov. (see notes on ch. ii. 2) was to be displayed.
3. עal є่ $\rho \omega \tau$ н̂кal $\sigma$ є́] 'yea, I besecch even thee.' The particle val (not kal, Rec., which has scarcely any critical support) has here its ustal and proper confirmatory force. It is used either (a) in assent to a direct question, Matth. ix. 28, John xi. 27, Rom. iii. 29 ; (b) in assent to an assertion, Matth. xv. 27, Mark vii. 28; (c) in graver assertions as confirmatory of what has preceded, Matth. xi. 26, Luke xi. 51, xii. 5 ; (d) in animated addresses as corroborating the substance of the petition, Philem. 20 (sce Mey. in loc.). The simple 'vis obsecrandi,' $=\mathrm{Heb}$. cannot be substantiated. For examples of its use in classical Greek, sce Viger, Idiom. Vir. 9, p. 424, Rost u. Palm, Lex. s. v. Vol. iI. p. 309.

On the distinction between $\epsilon \in \omega \tau \bar{\alpha} \nu$ ('rogaro,'equals) and aireîv ('petere,' - superiors), see Trench, Synon. § 40.
خ $\nu \dot{\eta} \sigma \iota \epsilon \sigma$ ú $\nu \zeta v \gamma \epsilon]$ 'true yolve-fellow,' 'dilectissime conjunx,' Claroman.-a translation that may have early been misunderstood. The explanations of these words are somewhat numerous. Setting aside doubtful or untenable conjectures, - that the person referred to is the wife of the apostle, Clem. Alex. Strom. III. 53 [grammatically incorrect (opp. to Alf.) as the uncertain gender of ov́v̧. (Eur. Alc. 315, 343) would cause quifotos to revert to three terminations],
the husband or brother of one of the women (Chrys., hesitatingly), Timothy (Estius), Silas (Beng.), Epaphroditus, though now with the apostle (Grot., Hamm.), Christ (Wiescler, Chronol. p. 458), - two opinions deserve consideration ; (a) that $\sigma \dot{v}{ }^{2}$ ̧uyos is a proper name, and that $\gamma v \hat{j} \sigma$ oos is used in allusion to the correspondence between the name of the man and his relation to the apostle, 'qui vere, et re et nomine, oúv̧uyos es,' Gom., Meyer; (l) that the chief of the eniokuтot (ch. i. 1) at Philippi is here referred to. Of these (a) harmonizes with the meaning of $\gamma \nu \eta$ nozos (comp. notes on 1 Tim. i. 2), and is slightly favored by the order (Luke i. 3, Galat. iii. 1 ; but ILL ; al. Rec. reverse it), but is improbablc on account of the apparently unique occurrence of the name. As the only valid objection to (b), - that St. Paul never elsewhere so designates any of his ouveproí (Mey.), may be diluted by the fact that the chief Bishop of the place stood in a somewhat different relation to such associates, and as the order is probably due to emphasis on $\gamma \nu \eta$ 'ुбte (Winer, Gr. § 59. 2, p. 469), the balance scems in favor of this latter view : so Luther, De Wette, and apparently the majority of modern expositors.
$\sigma v \lambda \lambda \alpha \mu \beta$. $\alpha u \dot{\tau} \alpha \hat{\imath} s]$ 'assist them,' scil. Euodia and Syntyche, in endeavoring to bring them to a state of $\delta \mu$ obota; not 'those women which,' Auth. and other Engl. Vy. (comp. Vulg. 'illas quæ'), -an inexact translation of aittves (see below) which obscures the reference of aùraîs to the preceding substantives. The middle $\sigma v \lambda \lambda \alpha \mu \beta$. occurs in a similar construction, Luke v. 7 ( ßonヘิєîv D), Gen. xxx. 8 (Alex.), 太lian, Var. Hist. II. 4, and with a gen. rei, Soph. Philoct. 282. The active is more usual, in this

Rejoice，show forbearance ； be not anxious，but tell your wants to God，and His peace shall be with you．


sense，in classical Greek；see examples in Rost u．Palm，Lex．s．v．
alt $\tau \nu \in S$ ］＇inasmuch as they，＇＇ut qux，＇
Beza，compare Syr．ひิテึ［quia ip－ sac］and see Scholef．Hints，p． 106 ：a very distinct use of the explicative force of ö́ris ：see notes on Gial．iv． 24.
$\dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \in \dot{u} a \gamma \gamma$ ．］Thic gospcl was the sphere in which the labor was expended； compare Reuss，Theul．Cliret．iv．8，Vol． 11．p．81．Meyer very appropriately calls attention to the fact that women were apparently the first in whom the gospel took root in Pliilippi；Acts xvi．
 －Women were the first fruits of St．Paul＇s labors on the continent of Europe，＇ Baum．on Acts，l．c．$\quad \mu \in \tau \grave{\alpha}$ ка．）K $\lambda$ nu．］＇in company with Clement also，＇scil．$\sigma u \nu \eta$ भ̀ $\uparrow \lambda \eta \sigma a \nu$ ：they were asso－ ciated with Clement and the apostle＇s other fellow－laborers at Plilippi in some efforts to advance the gospel，perhaps， as Beng．suggests，not unattended with danger；Acts xvi． 19 sq．，compare Plinl． i．28．It is doubtful whether the Clemeit here mentioned is identical with the third bp．of Rome，or not．On the one hand we have the very distinct testimony of Origen，in Joann．i．29，Vol．1v．p． 153 （ed．Ben．），Euseb．Hist．Ecel．111．4，15， Jerome，de Vir．Ill．xv．Vol．II．p． 839 （ed．Vallars．），Epiphanius，Har．xxvir． 6，Const．Apost．vir． 46 ；see Hammond， contr．Blond．p．254，Lardner，C＇redibitity， Ir．38．23．On the other hand（a）the notice of Clem．in Irenæus，Hcor．III． 3. $3, \delta$ kal $\mathfrak{\text { éwpakùs tò̀s } \mu \text { акарíous＇Atootó－}}$入ous kal＇rv $\mu \beta \in \beta \lambda \eta$ nkès aùrois，－where， hoivever，$\dot{\sigma} \nu \mu \epsilon \beta \lambda$ ．（most unnecessarily queried by Coniyb．and Bloomf．）should not be overlooked，－contains no allusion to this special commendation；and（b） the present context seems certainly in
favor of the supposition that Clement， like Euodia and Syntyche and（appy．） the ouveproi，was a member of the Church of Philippi．Still，as it is per－ fectly conceivable that a member of the Church of the Roman city of Philippi might have become 7 or 8 years after－ wards（Pearson，Minor Workis，Vot．II． p．${ }^{465 \text { ）Bp．of Rome，－as（b）is merely }}$ negative，and as the early testimony of Origen is positive and distinct，there seems no just ground for summarily re－ jecting，with De W．，Mey．，and Alf．，this ancient ecclesiastical tradition ；comparo Winer，RWB．Vol．1．p． $232 . \quad$ The position of kai between the prep．and the noun is somewhat unusual，such a collo－ cation being in the N．T．apparently con－ fined to $\gamma$ dp（John iv． 37 ），$\gamma \in$（Luko xi． 8），$\delta \epsilon ́($ Matth．xi．12），$\mu \in ́ v\rangle$（Rom．xi．22）， $\mu \dot{̀} \nu \gamma^{\alpha} \rho($ Acts xxviii．22），and $\tau \in$（Acts x．39）；compare Matth．Gr．§ 595．3．In the present case，however，the vinculum of the preposition extends over the whole clause，ral－ral（see notes on 1 Tim．iv． 10）being correlative．The examples cited by Alf．（compare Mey．），in which only a single kail occurs，are thus not fully in point．
§̀v $\tau$ đ̀ $\dot{\partial} \nu \delta \mu$ ．appear only to refer to $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \lambda o t-$ $\pi \hat{\omega} \nu$, －Clement whom I have men－ tioned by name，and the rest，who though not named by me，nevertheless have their names in the book of life ；＇comp．Luko x． 20 ，Rev．xiii． 8 ，xvii． 8 ，xx． 12 ，xxi． 27．To supply an optative（ $\epsilon \neq \eta$ ，＇ex－ stent＇）and assume that the（ （olmoi were now dead（Beng．），seems unnecessary and unsatisfactory．The expression is not improbably derived from the Old Test．；compare Exod．xxxii．32，Psalm lix．28，Isaiah iv．3，Ezck：xiii．9，Dan． xii． 1 ．
4．$\chi \propto\{\rho \in \tau \in]$ Separate exhortations to the church at large，continued to ver．



10．They commence with the exhorta－ tion，which，as has been already re－ marked（see notes on ch．iii．1），pervades the whole Epistle．On the repetition， Chrys．well observes，тои̃тo શapб⿱㇒́vovtós

 $\pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \chi \chi \eta{ }^{n} \in \mathfrak{l} \chi \alpha i \rho \in t$ ó roooútos ：see the good sermon of Beveridge on this text，Serm， cv．Vol．v．p． 62 sq．（A．－C．Libr．），and compare August．Serm．clxxy．Vol．v． p． 933 （ed．Migne）．
$\left.\pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \lambda \iota \epsilon^{2} \rho \hat{\omega}\right]$＇again $I$ will say，＇not＇I say，＇$\Lambda u$ uth，as $\epsilon$ è $\hat{\omega}$ ．seems regularly and correctly used throughout the N．T．as a future．The traces of a present $\epsilon \rho \epsilon \in \omega$ （Hippocr．Preccept．p．64，Epidem．11．p． 691）are fow and donbtful ；see Buttm． Irreg．Verls，p． 89 （Translation）．It is scarcely necessary to do finore than no－ tice the very improbable construction of Beng．，by which пáutore is joined with this clause．

5．$\tau \grave{\delta}$＇̇ $\pi t \in t \kappa$ ès $\dot{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu]$＇your for－ bearance，＇Conybeare，＇your moderation （Auth．）and readiness to waive all rigor and séverity：＇compare Josepl．Arch． Vr．12．7，ėтıєькєîs каї $\mu$ étpıot，and Loesn． Obs．p．358，where several examples are cited of èmtelkela in connection with $\pi \rho a \hat{v}-$ тทs，фi入avîpwtia，and $\dot{\eta} \mu \in \rho o ́ \tau \eta s . ~ S e e$ notes on I Tim．iii．3，and comp．Trench， Synon．§ 43．On the use of the abstract
 Jelf，Gr．§ 436．$\gamma$ ，and notes on ch．iii． 8 ；ald Rom．ii．4， 1 Corinth．i．25，and Glasse，Phitol．III．1，p． 537.
$\gamma \nu \omega \sigma \hat{\imath} 乡 \tau \omega \pi \hat{a} \sigma \iota \nu$ à $\nu \hat{\imath} \rho$ ．］＇become known to ull men ；＇＇let the grooduess of your principles in this respect be known experimentally by all who have dealings with you，be they epicurean enemies of the cross（Chrys．，Theoph．），or pagan persccutors＇（Theod．）．The command is wholly unrestricted．
$\delta K$ ípıos Ez $\gamma \gamma \dot{s}$ ］＇the Lord（Jesus）
is near．＇The exact meaning and con－ nection of the words is slightly doubtful． The regular meaning of Kúptos in St． Paul＇s Epistles（compare Winer，Gram． \＄19．1，p．113）and the demonstrable temporal meaning of éryìs（Matth．xxiv． 32，Rom．xiii．11，Rev．i．3）scem clearly to refer this not to a general readiness to help（Manning，Serm．xirx．Vol．ilr．p． 241），but specially to the Lord＇s second advent，which the inspired apostle re－ gards as nigh，yet not necessarily as im－ mediate，or to happen in his own life－ time．That the carly church expected a speedy return of Christ，－that they thought that $\mathrm{He}_{\mathrm{c}}$＇that was to come would come，and would not tarry；＇is not to bo denied．This general expectation， however，founded on our Master＇s own declarations，and on the knowledge that
 katpol ÜбTєpot were already come，both is and ought to be，separated from any specific and personal anticipations of which the N．Test．presents no certain trace．With regard to the connection，it may be either minatory（Schocttg．Hor． Vol．1．p．803）or encouraging（De W．） with regard to what has preceded，or， more probably，consolatory with refer－ ence to what follows（Chrys．），or，not unlikely，a bond of union to both（Alf．）： on the one hand，the Lord＇s specdy com－ ing（as Judge）adds a stimulus to our exhibition of forbearance toward others， comp．James v． 9 ；on the other，it swal－ lows up all unprofitable anxietics．

6．$\mu \eta \delta \dot{\epsilon} \nu \mu \in \rho\llcorner\mu \nu$ ．］＇be careful about nothing；＇＇entertain no disquieting anx－ ieties about anything earthly，＇Matth．vi． 25．The accusative is that of the olject
 $G r . \S 551$ ），and stands in emphatic an－ tithesis to the following èv $\pi a \nu \tau$ i．Chrys． and Theophyl．refer $\mu \eta \delta \in \nu$ mainly to the pressure of calamity or persecution（ $\mu$ भ́тє


 $\psi \in \omega s$ ，Theoph．）：it seems better to leave it wholly unrestricted．The practical applications of the text will be found in Beveridge，Serm．Vol．v．p． 181 sq． （ 1. －C．Libr．）．
$\epsilon \nu \quad \pi \alpha \nu \tau]$ ＇in everything，＇equally unrestricted；not ＇in all time，＇Syr．，Nth．，but，＇in omni－
 $\mu a \tau \iota$ ，Chrys．The translation of Vulg．， ＇in omni oratione＇（so Clarom．），which Mcyer，and after him Alford defend as meaning＇in omni（re）oratione，＇etc．，is certainly rather suspicious．
$\tau \hat{\eta} \pi \rho \circ \sigma \in \cup \chi \hat{\eta}$ к．т．ג．］＇by your prayer and your supplication，＇by the specific prayer offered up when the occasion may require it；compare Middleton，Art．v． 1． 3,4 ，p． 93 （ed．Rose）．The repeti－ tion of the article gives an emphasis to the words；each noun is enunciated in－ dependently：see Winer，Gr．§ 19．5，p． 117．The difference between the more general rpor．（precatio）and the more special $\delta$ é $\eta \sigma$ ．（rogatio）is stated in notes on Eph．vi．18，and on 1 Tim．ii． 1.
$\mu \in T \grave{\alpha} \in \dot{v} \chi \propto \rho$.$] ＇with thanksgiving，＇an$ adjunct to prayer that should never be wanting， 1 Thess．v．18， 1 Tim．ii． 2 ； see Beveridge，Serm．cvir．Vol．v．p． 76 sq. （A．－C．Libr．）compare notes on Col．iii．15．Alford remarks on the omission of the article，＇because the matters themselves may not be recog－ nized as grounds of ev̉Xapiotia．＇It seems more simple to say that euxap．， ＇thanksgiving for past blessings＇（com－ pare Hofm．Schrifl．Vol．11．2，p．337）， is in its nature more general and compre－ hensive，$\pi \rho \circ \sigma$ ．and $\delta \dot{́} \eta \sigma$ ．almost necessa－ rily more limited and specific．Hence， thongh eủ $\chi a p$ ．occurs twelve times in St． Paul＇s Epistles，it is only twice used with the article， 1 Cor．xiv． 16,2 Cor． iv． 15.
$\tau \grave{\alpha} \alpha i \tau \dot{\eta} \mu \alpha \tau \alpha]$
＇your requests；＇according to termina－ tion，＇the things requested＇（compare Buttm．Gr．§ 119．7），and thence（as the context requires），with a slight modifi－ cation of meaning，＇the purport or sub－ jects of prayer ：＇＇petitum，materia $\delta \in \eta$－ $\sigma \in \omega s$ ，＇Beng．；compare Luko xxiii．24， 1 John v．15．There is often，especially in later Greek，a sort of libration of meaning between nouns in $\sigma$ os and $-\mu \alpha$ ； compare 2 Tim．i．13，al．Mcyer quotes Plato，Rep．viri．p． 566 в，where the explanatory clause airciv $\tau \delta \nu \delta \bar{\eta} \mu o \nu$（sce Stallb．in loc．）seems to show that there is even there also some tinge of such an interchange． $\pi \rho \delta s \tau \partial \nu$ $\Theta \in \dot{o} \nu$ ］＇toward Goll，＇i．e．＇before and unto God，＇the prep．denoting the ethical direction of the prayer；see Winer，G＇r． § 49 ．h，p． 371.
7．Kal＇$\dot{\eta} \in i p$ ．$\tau 0 \hat{v}$ © $\Theta o \hat{v}]$＇and （so）the peace of God，＇the peace which comes from Him and of which IIe is the source and origin；gen．auctoris，or rather originis（Hartung，Casus，p．17， Scheucrl．Synt．§ 17，p．125），belonging to the general category of the genitive of ablation（Donalds．Gr．§ 448）．On the use of the consecutive кal（Ileb．xii．19， al．），see Winer，Gram．§ 53.3, p． 387.
 （sec below，ver．9）is somewhat doubt－ ful．Three meanings have been assigned to eip $\quad$ ขn ；（a）＇concurd；＇＇studium pa－ cis，unitatis，concordix，inter homines atque in ecclesiâ＇（Pol．Syn．），appar－ ently adopted by Theodoret（ $\omega$ s $\dot{\operatorname{s} \pi} \alpha \lambda \lambda \eta^{\prime}-$
 тìv єip．＇̇ $\pi \eta \dot{\jmath} \xi a \tau 0$ ），and strenuously ad－ vocated by Meyer in loc．；$(\beta)$＇reconcil－ iation＇with God；ì катa入入aүभ，方 à子á－ $\pi \eta$ тô̂ ©eov̂，Chrys． 1 ；compare Rom． v．1，and Green，Gr．p． 262 ；$(\gamma)^{\text {＇peuce，＇}}$ i．c．the deep tranquillity of a soul rest－ ing wholly upon God，－the antithesis


to the solicitude and anxiety engendered by the world and worldliness ；compare John xiv． 27 ；Chrys．2，Beza，Beng．，al． Of these（ $\alpha$ ）seems clearly insufficient and not in harmony with the context ； $(\beta)$ points in the right direction，but is unnecessarily restrictive ；$(\gamma)$ is fully in accordance with the context（comp．$\mu \eta \delta \bar{\delta} \nu$ $\mu \epsilon \rho \iota \nu_{0}$, ver．6），includes（ $\beta$ ），and gives a full and spiritual meaning ：so De W．， Wiesing．，Alf．，and most modern com－ mentators ；compare notes on Col．iii． 15.
 passeth every understanding；＇＇which transcendetle every effort and attempt on the part of the understanding to grasp and realize it．＇Nous here，as the context suggests，points to the human $\pi \nu \in \hat{\nu} \mu \alpha$ ＇quatenus cogitat et intelligit＇（Olshaus． Opusc．p．156），－a meaning，however， in many，perhaps the majority of cases in the N．T．，not sufficiently comprelien－ sive；see notes on 1 Tim．vi．5，and on 2 Tim．iii．8．It may be observed that the term voûs is apparently used by the sacred writers，not to denote any sepa－ rate essence or quality different from the $\pi \nu \epsilon \bar{\nu} \mu \alpha$ ，but as a manifestation or outcom－ ing of the same in moral and intellectual action，the human $\pi \nu \in \hat{v} \mu a$ ，＇quatenus cogitat，intelligit，et vult，＇－the exact limits of this definition being in all cases best fixed by the immediate context：see especially Beck，Seelenl．Ir．18，p． 48 sq．， Delitzsch，Bibl．Psych．Iv．5，p．145，and compare Schubert，Gesch．der Seele，Vol． ir．p． 494 sq ．On the use of the transi－ tive $\mathfrak{v} \pi \epsilon \rho \in \in \chi \in \iota \nu$ with an accus．of the ob－ ject surpassed（contrast chap．ii．3），see Jelf，Gr．§ 504．obs． 2.
ф poupń $\epsilon \in$ ］＇shall guard，＇keep；＇not optative，＇custodiat，＇Vulg．，Claroman．， and in effect Chrys．סraфu入ágete kal à $\sigma$－ $\phi$ वरícaıтo，but simply future，as in Goth． ＇fastaip＇［servabit，－not＇servat，＇De

Gab．；Goth．pres．commonly supplies place of Greek future］，Coptic，al．；the event will follow if the exhortation $\mu \eta \delta \ll \nu$ $\kappa . \tau . \lambda$ ．is attended to．We can searecly say with Conyb．that фpovp．is literally ＇shall garrison＇（2 Cor．xi．32，Thucyd． III．17，Plato，Rep．Iv．p． 420 A），as the idea of＇watchiny over，＇＇guarding，＇ac－ cords with derivation $[\phi \rho o=\pi \rho \sigma$ ，and Homeric OP－；Pott，Et．lorsch．Vol． 1. p．122］，and appears both in connection with persons and things ；Sophoc．OEd． Rex，1479，Eurip．Cycl．686，Herc．Fur： 399 ；Hesych．фроupeî．фи入áттєl．The nature of the фpoúp $\bar{\sigma}$ ts is more nearly defined by $\epsilon \nu \mathrm{X} \rho$ ．＇I $\eta \sigma$ ．which appears to denote，not so much with a scmi－local reference（ $\omega \sigma \tau \epsilon \mu \grave{\eta}$ èк $\kappa \epsilon \sigma \epsilon i ̂ v$ aùroû $\tau \hat{\eta} s$ $\pi$ i $\sigma$ tews，Chrys．）the sphere in which they were to be kept，as that in which the action was to take place ；sce Meyer in loc． $\tau$ às карठías к．т．入．］：your hearts and your thoughts；＇ ＇corda vestra et cogitationes vestras，＇ Copt．，死th．The distinction between these two words should not be obscured． Kapoia，properly the（imaginary）seat of the $\psi u \chi$＇，the＇Lebens－Mitte＇（see Beck， Seelenl．III．20，p．63），is used with con－ siderable latitude of meaning to denote the centre of feeling，willing，thinking， and even of moral life（see especially De－ litzsch，Bibl．Psych．Iv．11，p． 203 sq．），。 and，to speak roughly，bears much the same relation to the $\psi u \chi \grave{\eta}$ that voûs bears to $\pi \nu \epsilon \bar{v} \mu \alpha$（see above），being in fact the $\psi v \chi \grave{\eta}$ in its practical aspects and rela－ tions；see Olshaus．Opusc．p． 155 sq ．， and notes on 1 Tim．i．5．The vońfaca， on the other hand，are properly（as here） the products of spiritual activity，of think－ ing，willing，etc．（ 2 Cor．ii．11），and oc－ casionally and derivatively，the imple－ ments or instruments of the same， 2 Cor． iii．14，iv．4：see Beck，Seclenl．11．19，

Practise all that is good, and all that you have learned from me.


p. 59, Roos, Psych. Iv. 26. The meaning is thus in effect as stated by Alf., ' your hearts themselves (?) and their fruits ;' or as, briefly, by Beng., 'cor sedes cogitationum.' On biblical psychology generally, see the remarks in pref. to Past. Epist. p. v., and notes on 1 Tim. iii: 16.
8. $\tau \delta \lambda o \iota \pi \delta \nu$ ] 'Finally;' concluding recapitulation, in an emphatic and comprehensive summary, of the chief subjects for preparatory meditation and (ver. 9) consequent practice. The formula is here more definitely conclusive
 iii. 1 (see notes), where the nature of the exhortations led to a not unnatural digression. It thus echoes, yet, owing to the difference of the exhortations, does not resume (Matth.) the preceding $\tau \delta$ $\lambda o \pi r \delta \nu$. The sixfold repetition of ${ }^{\circ} \sigma \alpha$ adds much to the vigor and emphasis of the exhortation. On the whole verse see thirteen able sermons by Whichcote, Works, Yol. III. p. 368 sq.
$\dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta$ ते $\hat{\eta}$ ] 'true:' i. e., as the context requires, in their nature and practical applications, 'genere morum,' Whichcote: so Theoph. (comp. Chrys.) ¿̉ $\eta \uparrow \uparrow \hat{\eta}$.
 compare Eph. iv. 21. To restrict the reference to words (Beng., Bisp.), or to doctrine (Hamm.), seems undesirable; the epithets throughout are general and inclusive. $\left.\sigma \in \mu \nu \alpha{ }^{\prime}\right]$ 'seemly,' 'venerable,' 'deserving of, and receiving, respect,' Syr. ©n' [verecunda] : compare Hor. Epist. 1. 1. 11, 'quid rerum atque decens curo et rogo.' The Vulg. 'pudica' is too special, the Auth. 'honest' scarcely exact. As the derivation suggests ( $\sigma$ ' $\beta o \mu \alpha$, ), the adjective primarily marks whatever calls for 'respect' or 'veneration,' and thence, with a somewhat special application, whatever is so
seemly and grave ( 0 ö $\sigma a \quad{ }_{\epsilon}{ }^{2} \nu \sigma \chi \eta \mu \alpha \sigma \iota \nu$ кal $\lambda \delta \gamma o t s$, кal $\beta a \delta i \sigma \mu \alpha \sigma t$ кal $\pi \rho \alpha \dot{\xi} \in \sigma t \nu$, Ecumen.) as always to secure it ; see Whichcote, p. 399. Toे $\sigma \in \mu \nu$ óv, according to this able writer, consists in 'grave behavior' and 'composure of spirit,' and is briefly characterized by Calvin as 'in hoc situm ut digne vocatione nostrà ambulemus:' hence such associations as $\sigma \xi \mu \nu \partial \nu$ кal áyto, Plato, Soph. p. 249 A ; $\mu \in ́ \tau p t a$ каl $\sigma \in \mu \nu \alpha ́$, Clem.-Rom. 1 Cor. § 1 ; compare notes on 1 Tim. ji. 2.
$\delta[k \alpha \iota a]$ 'just ; ' in its widest application, 'quæ talia sunt qualia esso oportet,' 'Tittm. Synon. p. 19 : not exactly 'just and equal,' Whichcote, but rather 'just and right,' whether from the proportions of things or constitutions of the law (Whichcote, Vol. Iv. p. 10), without any reference to others (Col. iv. 1) : compare Acts. x. 22, Rom. v. 7, 1 Tim. i. 9. On the distinction between Síkatos and the more limited áyaíós, see Tittm. Synon. p. 19 sq., and on that between ס'ík. and értos notes on Tit. i. 8.
\& $\left.\gamma \nu \alpha{ }^{\prime}\right]$ 'pure ; ' 2 Cor. vii. 11, 1 Tim. v. 22 : not 'chaste,' Grot., Est., al., in the more special and limited meaning of the word. On the use of ć $\gamma \nu$ ós and its distinction from äyos (with which the Vulgate appears here to have interchanged it), see notes on 1 Tim. v. 22, and Tittmann, Synon. I. p. 21 sq. Chrys. draws a correct line between this and the preceding $\sigma \epsilon \mu \nu \delta \delta s$; $\tau \delta \partial \epsilon \mu \nu \partial \nu \tau \hat{\eta} s$
 $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \phi เ \lambda \hat{\eta}]$ 'lovely' (ár. $\lambda \in \gamma \delta \mu_{\mathrm{r}}$ ), not merely in reference to our fellow-men, 'per que sitis amabiles hominibus,' Est. (compare Ecclus. iv. 7), nor even with exclusive reference to Gorl ( $\mathfrak{a} \pi \epsilon \rho \mathcal{\epsilon} \sigma \tau\rangle \tau \hat{\psi}$ Өєफ़ $\pi \rho o \sigma \phi$., Theod.) but generally, whatever both in respect of itself, and the disposition of the doer (Whichcote), conciliates love, is generous and noble. Sce



the good exemplifications of $\tau \delta \pi \rho \rho o \sigma \phi t-$ $\lambda$＇śs，in Whicheote，Serm．Lxxy．Vol．I7． p． 88 sq．
 good report；＇not merely＇que bonam famam pariunt＇（Grot．，Calv．），but，in accordance with the more literal mean－ ing of the word，＇well－sounding＇（Luth．）， ＇of auspicious nature when spoken of，＇
 ＇great and bright truths＇in relation to God，ourselves，and our fellow－men， which sound well of themselves（loquun－ tur res），and command belief and enter－ tainment，Whichcote，p． 108 sq ．
$\epsilon \grave{l} \tau$ Ls $\grave{\alpha} \rho \in \tau \dot{\prime}]^{\prime}$＇whatever virtue there be，＇Scholef．Ifints，p．107，or more accu－ rately＇there is，＇Alf．，it being assumed that there is such；see Latham，English Luny．§ 614 （cd．3），and comp．Words－ worth in loc．：recapitulation of the fore－ going，with ref．perhaps to all the epithets except the last，which scems to be gen－ eralized by the following Ërauvos．｀Apєті̀ ［from a root AP－and connected with Sauscr．vř̌，＇protegere，＇Pott，Litym． Forsch．Vol．I．p．221，Donalds．Crat． §285］is only found elsewhere in the N．T．in 2 Pet．i． 5 （in reference to man； compare Wisdom iv．1）and 1 Pet．ii． 9 ， 2 Pet．i． 3 （in ref．to God；comp．Hab． iii． 2 ，Isaiah xlii．8，al．）：it designates， as Meyer observes，＇moral excelience in
 $\mu \hat{\epsilon} \nu \nu \nu \dot{\epsilon} \mu \pi \epsilon \epsilon \rho i(a$, Hesych．$)$ ，and is opposed to кanía，Plato，Republ iv． 444 D， 445 c： see Whicheote，Vol．iv．p． 120.
€゙тatvos］＇praise；＇not＇id quod est laudabile，＇C̣alv．，or，＇ea qux laudem apud homines mereantur，＇Est．，－but ＇praise，＇in its simple sense，which，as Whicheote observes，＇regularly follows upon virtue，and is a note of it and a pieco of the reward thereof，＇p．132．The
addition èmtбテŋ̄uns afier ěratv，with． D＇E：FG；Clarom．，some mss．of Vulg．． al．，is an interpolation properly rejected by all modern editorrs．
$\lambda \circ \gamma[\zeta \epsilon \sigma N \epsilon]$＇think on，＇＇take account of，＇not however merely＇bear them in your thonghts，＇＇meditate＇（Alf．），but ＇use your faculties upon them，＇＇horum rationem habete，＇Beng．；comparo 1 Cor． xiii． 5 ，and sce Whicheote，p． 138.
9．at $\kappa \alpha l]$＇which also：＇exemplifica－ tion of the foregoing in the apostle him－

 túrov，Chrysost．The first kai is ascen－ sive（＇facit transitionem a generalibus （ $\ddot{\sigma} \mathrm{\sigma a}$ ）ad Paulina，＇Beng．），－not＇et，＇ Vulg．（Syr．，Copt．omit），but＇etiam，＇ Luth．，the other three simply copulative， the sentence falling into two portions
 nected by kat，each of which again is similarly inter－connected：＇duo priora verba ad ductrinam pertinent，duo reli－ qua ad exemplum，＇Estius；compare

 Van Heng．，Mey．，Wiesinger，al． $\pi \quad \alpha \rho \in \lambda \alpha \beta \in \tau \epsilon]$＇rcceived；＇not，how－ ever，in a purely passive（Galat．i．12， 1 Thess．ii．13），but，as the climactic or－ der of the words（compare jikoúv．kal eti．）seems to suggest，with a somewhat active reference（John i．11， 1 Cor．xv． 1）；compare Dion．－Halic．I．p． $44, \lambda \epsilon \gamma \gamma$
 incolis percepi），and the somewhat simi－ lar àva入aßeĩ èv kapóía，Job xxii． 22. The distinction of Grot．＇$e \mu d$＇$\hat{e}$ ete signifi－ cat primam institutionem ：$\pi a \rho \in \lambda \lambda^{d} \beta \in \tau \epsilon$ exactiorem doctrinam＇（＇̇̀ $\gamma \gamma \mathrm{p}^{\prime} \phi \omega \mathrm{s}$ ，The－ oph．，－but qu．reading）secms lexieally doubtful：for examples of $\pi a p a \lambda$ ．seo Kypke，Obṣ．Vol．xi．p． 222.

I rejoiced in your renewed aid：yct I am content and want not．Ye have freely supplied my needs，and God shall supply yours．


#### Abstract

 


$\dot{\eta} \kappa \circ \cup \dot{v} \sigma a \tau \in$ does not refer to any form of teaching or preaching（＇refertur ad familiares sermones，＇Grot．，Hammond）， but，as the division of members，noticed above，seems to require，to the example which the apostle had set them when he was with them；－this they heard from others，and further saw for themsclveis． ${ }^{\prime} E \nu \epsilon \notin o l$ thus belongs more especially to the two latter verbs，the prep．Ev denot－ ing the sphere，and as it were substratum of the action；sce notes on Galat．i．24， and Winer，Gr．§ 48．a，p． 545.
$\tau \alpha \hat{v} \tau \alpha \pi \rho \alpha \sigma \sigma \in \tau \epsilon]$ Parallel to the preceding $\tau \alpha \hat{\tau} \tau \alpha$ गoरi $\zeta_{\epsilon \sigma \hat{N} \epsilon \text { ，without how－}}$ ever suggesting any contrast between ＇acting＇and＇thinking ；＇入oyis．（sec notes）having a distinctly practical ref－ erence；see Meyer in loc．
$\kappa \alpha \ell \delta \Theta \in \delta s$ к．т．$\lambda$ ．］＇and（so）the God of peace；＇compare ver．7，where кail has a similarly consecutive force，and sce notes on ver．12．The expression $\delta \Theta \in \partial s$ $\tau \hat{\eta} s$ eip．admits of different explanations according to the meaning assigned to єịpク́v̀，sce Reuss，Théul．Chrét．iv．18， Vol．II．p．201．Here thero seems no reason to depart from the meaning as－ signed in ver． 7 ；the gen．being a form of the gen．of content，or（which is nearly allied to it）of the characterizing attribute ； see Scheuerl．Syut．§ 16．3，p．115，and comp．Andrewes，Serin．xviir．Vol．Ix． p． 84 （A．－C．Libr．）．

10．$\left.\epsilon^{2} \chi \propto \dot{\alpha} \rho \eta \nu \quad \delta \epsilon \in\right]$＇Now $I$ rejoiced：＇ transition to more special matters，the $\delta \frac{1}{\epsilon}$ being $\mu \in \tau \alpha \beta a \tau \iota \kappa o ́ v$（IIartung，Partilk．Vol． 1．p．165），and marking the change to a

 The addition $\epsilon \nu$ Kvpi $\dot{\omega}$ serves to define the nature of the joy；it was neither selfish nor cartbly，it was in his Lord and without Him was not；see notes on
 at length，＇＇tandem aliquando，＇Vulg．， Rom．i． 10 ；more fully expressed in $\Lambda$ ris－
 －グठ $\eta$ acquiring that meaning from ref． to something long looked for；see Har－ tung，Partil．そ̌ँ $\eta, 2,4$ ，Vol．1．p． 238. Do Wette adopts the translation＇jetzt cinmal，＇＇jam aliquando＇（comp．Plato， Symp．p． 216 x ），on the ground that the more usual transl．involves a tacit re－ proach．This is not the case．The apostle，as the Philippians well knew，in all cases preferred maintaining himself： now，however，his captivity seemed to call for their aid；compare Neand．Phi－ lipp．p． 25.
$\alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu \in \mathcal{N} \dot{\alpha}$ ． $\lambda \in \tau \in \quad$ c．T．$\lambda$.$] ＇put forth new shoots，$ flourished again，in respect of your solici－ tude for me；＇＇refloruistis pro me sen－ tire，＇Vulgate，and less literally，Syriac
 cœpistis curam habere mci］．There is some little difficulty both in the coustruc－ tion and the exegesis．The verb àva－ Nád $\lambda \in \iota \nu$ may be either transitive（Ezek． xrii．24，Ecclus．i．18），or intransitive （Psalm xxriii．7，Wisdom iv．4）．In the former case the construction is plain （ $\tau \delta$ ט́rধ̇ค к．$\tau$ ．$\lambda$ ．being a simple accusa－ tive after the verb），but the exegesis un－ satisfuctory，as tho $\dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha \alpha^{2} \alpha{ }^{\prime} \lambda \lambda \epsilon \nu \nu$ would ap－ pear dependent on the will of the Phi－ lippians，which the context certainly seems to contradict．In the latter，adopt－ cd by Vulg．，Copt．，Syr．，and the Greck commentators the exegesis is less diffi－ cult，but the construction somewhat am－ biguous．Either（a）$\tau \delta$ vinধ̀ $\bar{\epsilon} \mu \circ \hat{v}$ is the accus．object．after фpoveìv，the verb it－ self being somewhat laxly appended to $\dot{\alpha} \nu \in \uparrow \dot{a} \lambda$ ．，Beng．，Mey．，Alf．；or（b）т $\delta$ บ์rèp $̇$ Épov̂，фpoveiv is the accus，of the
quantitative object (notes on Eph. iv. 15) dependent on ả $\nu \in \hat{N} \alpha{ }^{\lambda} \lambda \in \tau \epsilon$, Winer, Gram. § 44. 1, p. 284, Wiesing., Bisp., and apparently Chrysost, and Theophyl. (who interpolates eis). Of these (a) is artificial and contrary to the current and sequence of the Greek: (b) is simple and intelligible, but certainly involves the difficulty that the following clause (if we retain the proper and obvious reference
 ט́mèp ${ }^{\epsilon} \mu \mathrm{\mu} \hat{\nu}$ фpovєiv. As, however, this logical diñ̉culty may be diluted by observing that фpoveî is not used exactly in the same sense in the two clauses, $\tau \delta \quad \dot{v} \pi \dot{\epsilon} \rho \frac{\xi}{\epsilon} \mu 0 \hat{v} \phi \rho$. in fact coulescing to form a new idea, - and as $(\alpha)$ is not only artificial, but involves an undue emphasis
 ly adopt (८) : so Wiesing. and Bisping. Lastly, à $\nu \in$ ©ád $\lambda \epsilon \tau \epsilon$ does not involve any
 $p \alpha \nu ה \eta \sigma \alpha \nu$, Chrysost.): the time during
 avoidable torpor; when the suitable time
 Andremes, Serm. xriil. Vol. ini. p. 99 (A.-C. Libr.).

The rare aor. d. $\nu \in ́ n$. is noticed by Winer, § 15, Buttm. Irreg: Verls, s. v. הád $\lambda \omega$.
' $\phi$ ' $\Psi]$ 'for which,' 'with a vierv to which,' 'in contemplation of which;' the $\bar{\epsilon} \pi l$ marking the object contemplated: not 'sicut,' Vulg., Syr., 'in quo,' Copt., interpretations which obscure the proper force of the prepositions. On the meanings of ' ${ }^{\prime} \phi$ ' ${ }_{\psi}$, sce the notes on ch. iii. 12. $\kappa \alpha) \epsilon \notin \rho \circ \nu \in \hat{\delta} \tau \epsilon]$ 'ye also were anxious, careful; ' imperf., marking the continuance of the action, to which the кai adds a further emphasis: 'your care for me was of no sudden growth, it did not show itself just when the need came, - far from it, you were also anxious long before you d̀ $\nu \in$ ลిd $\lambda \in \tau \epsilon$.' The omission of $\mu \hat{e} \boldsymbol{\nu}$ after é $\phi p o \nu$. gives, as Meyer observes,
a greater vigor to the antithesis; see IKlotz, Devar. Vol. II. p. 356, compare notes on Gal. ii. 15.
ウ$\kappa \alpha เ \rho \in \hat{\imath} \sigma$ งे $\epsilon$ ] 'ye were lacling opportunity;' i. e. 'it was not from any barrenness on your part,' Wordsw. 'Akalp. (an ${ }_{\alpha}^{\prime \prime} \pi$. $\lambda \in \gamma \delta \mu$.) is a word of later Greek, the opposite of which is єùkaupeiv ( $\epsilon \dot{U} \sigma \chi 0 \lambda \hat{i}, s$ ${ }_{\kappa}^{\chi} \chi \in เ \nu$ ), a form equally condemned by the Atticists; Lobeck, Pliryn. p. 125, Thom. M. p. 830. Chrysostom refers the term specially to the temporal means of the
 vía. $\hat{\eta} \tau \epsilon$, and urges the popular use of àкаı. in that sense. It may have been so; it scems, however, safer to preserve the ordinary temporal reference; see above.
 mean that:' see notes on ch. iii. 12, Winer, Gr. § 64. 6, p. 526. The apostle does not wish his joy at this proof of their sympathy to be misunderstood as mere satisfaction at being relieved from present want or pressure. $\kappa \alpha \vartheta^{\circ}$ $\dot{\delta} \sigma \tau \in \rho \eta \sigma \iota \nu]$ 'in consequence of want,' 'propter penuriam,' Vulg., sim. Syriac
 defuerit mihi]; see notes on chap. ii. 3, and on Tit. iii. 5, where this meaning of кarà is briefly investigated. Van Heng., to preserve the more usual meaning of the prep., gives $\dot{\text { d }} \sigma \tau \epsilon \in \rho \eta \sigma \iota \nu$ a concrete reference, 'ut more receptum est penurix;' this is artificial and unnecessary. The
 Theodoret; ' notio secundum facile transit in notionem propter,' Kühner, Xenoph. Mem. 1. 3. 12. є่ $\gamma \dot{\omega}$ $\gamma \grave{\alpha} \rho$ モ́ $\mu \alpha \star o \nu$ ] 'for I for my part have learned,' not ' learned,' Alf., which represents the action as too remote to suit the English idiom. In the Greek nothing
 place after a given time (see Donalds.

## 

Gr. § 432) ; whether it does or does not last to the present time is left unnoticed; see especially Fritz. de Aor. Vi, p. 16 sq. The è $\gamma \dot{\omega}$ is emphatic, ' quidquid alii sentiunt aut cupiunt,' and $\check{\epsilon} \mu a \underset{o v}{ } \nu$, as the tenor of the verse seems to indicate, refers to a teaching derived, not 'divinitus,' Beng., but, from the practical ex-


è $\nu$ ois $\mathrm{ei} \mu \mathrm{l}]$ ' in what state $I \mathrm{am}$ :' not, on the one hand, with reference merely to his present state, which is too limited.-nor on the other hand, with reference to any possihle state, ' in quocunque statu sim,' Raphel (compare Auth.), which would require ăv, -hut with reference to the state in which he is at the time of consideration; atmost ' in every state that I come into.' The expression èv oîs (no cllipse of $\chi$ phinu$\sigma t v$, Wolf, al.), is copiously illustrated by Wetstein in lor.; see also Kypke, Obs. Vol. ir. p. 319.
$a \dot{v} \tau \dot{\alpha} \rho \kappa \eta s$ ] 'content,' 'ut sufficiat milhi id quod est mihi,' Syr. (compare IIeb.
 self-supporting,' 'independent,' the opposite being, as Meyer observes, $\pi \rho \rho \sigma$ $\delta \in \grave{\lambda} s$ ü $\lambda \lambda \omega \nu$, Plato, Tim. 33 D ; compare Arist. Ettuic. Nic. 1. 5, тò ré̀etov àyā̈d̀ айтаркes eivau סоке̂̀: see notes on 1 Tim. vi. 6 , and Barrow, Serm. xxxfi. Vol. r1. p. 404. The practical inferences deducible from this verse are well statect by Sanderson, Serm. v. (ad Aul.).
12. oī $\delta \alpha$ каi $\tau \alpha \pi \epsilon i \nu$.] 'I lnow (how) also to be abased :' second member
 $\mu \in \mu$ únuau к. т. л.) explaining more in detail the preceding èv oìs cipli aùtápr. eivau: the apostle, as Andrewes well says, 'had stayed affections.' The first kal thus serves to annex the special instance ( $\tau \alpha$ $\pi \epsilon \mathrm{v}$. ) to the more general statement (see notes on Eph. v. 18, Winer, Gr. §53.3,
p. 388, ed. 6), the second appends to ramelv, its opposite, and is thus copulative and indirectly contrastive. The use of kal in the N. T., as the Aramaic O would have led us à priori to suppose, is somewhat varied. Though all are really included in the two broad distinctions et and etiam (see especially Klotz, Detar. Vol. II. p. 635), we may perliaps conveniently enumerate the following subdivisions. Under the first (et) ral appears as, ( $\alpha$ ) simply copulutive; ( $\beta$ ) adjunctive, i. e. either when the special is annexed to the general as here, Mark i. $5_{5}$, Eph. vi. 19, al., or conversely the gencral to the special, Matthew xxvi. 59; $(\gamma)$ consccutive, nearly 'and so,' verse 9, 1 Thessalonians, iv. 1, compare James ii. 23, Matthew xxiii. 32, al. Under the sccond (etiam) kai appears as, ( $\delta$ ) ascensice, 'even,' a very common and varied usage (compare notes on Ephesians, i. 11), or converscly, descensive, Gal. iii. 4, Eph. v. 12, where see notes; ( $\epsilon$ ) explanatory, approaching nearly to 'namely,' 'that is to sny,' John i. 16, Gal. ii. 20 , wi. 16 , where see notes; ( () comparative, especially in double-membered clauses, see notes on Eph. v. 23 ; to all which we may perhaps add a not uncommon use of kai, which may be termed $(\eta)$ its contrasting force, as here ( $2^{\mathrm{d}}$ kai), and more strongly, Mark xii. 12, 1 Thess. ii. 18 ; compare 1 Cor. ix. ${ }_{5,6}$ ( $2^{\mathrm{d}}$ kai). In such a case the particlo is not adversative, as often asserted, but copulative and contrasting ; the opposition arises merely from the juxtaposition of clauses involving opposing or dissimilar sentiments. These seven heads apparently include all the more common uses of ral in the N. T.; for further examples see the well arranged list in Bruder, Concord. s. v. kal, and the much improved notice in the sisth ed. of Winer, Gr. § 53. 3.

The


 any authority, and is rightly rejected by apparently all modern editors.
$\pi \in \rho เ \sigma \sigma \in \dot{v} \in \iota \nu]$ 'to abound.' The opposition between $\tau a \pi \epsilon i \nu$. and $\pi \in \rho \iota \sigma \sigma$, is not exactly perfect (contrust Math. xxiii. 12, 2 Cor. xi. 7, and above, Phil. ii. 8, 9), but still need not involve a dcparture from the lexical meaning of either word. The former ( (ateliv.) is more general ('to be cast down,' - not expressly, $\lambda \iota \mu \omega \tau \tau \epsilon i \bar{\nu}$, Ecum., and sim. even De W.), but obviously includes the idea of the pressure and dejection arising from want (comp. Weth.); the latter is more specific. The paraphrase of Pelag. (cited by Meyer) is thus perfectly satisfactory, 'ut nee abundantià extollar, nee frangar inopiâ.
दे $\left.\nu \pi \alpha \nu \tau\} \kappa \alpha\} द^{2} \nu \pi \bar{\alpha} \sigma \iota \nu\right]$ ' in everything and in all things,' 'in omni et in omnibus,' Clarom., Goth., not 'ubique et in omnibus,' Tulg., Auth., -an assumed ellipssis of $\tau o ́ \pi \varphi$ (Clirys. supplies

 after $\pi$ û̃w ; compare 2 Cor. ix. 8. The expression seems designed to be perfectly gencral and inclusive, èv maval
 Phot. ap. ©eum. $\quad \mu \in \mu \dot{v} \eta$ $\mu a t]$ 'I have been initiated, fully taught,' ' institutus sum,' Vulg., Clarom., Copt.; iil Ajoco [exercitatus sum] Syr., 'assuctus sum,' Eth. ;-climactic, see above. The word is an $\ddot{\alpha} \pi$. $\lambda \in \gamma \delta \mu$. in the N. T., and appears used, not in its primary sense, 'disciplinà areanâ imbutus
 vos, Hesych.), but in its derivative sense, 'I have been fully instructed ' ( $\mu$ ívots.
 haps some referonce to the practical mode in which the knowledge was aequired;
$\pi \in i ̂ p a \nu$ ámávz $\omega \nu$ é $\chi \omega$, Phot. ap. ©cum.; see Suicer, Thessur. s. v. Vol. ir. p. 379 sq. As $\mu \nu$ îivat is used with an accus. of the thing (Plato, Symp. p. 200 E, and see examples in Rost u. Yalm, Lex. s. v.), more rarely with a gen. (Heliod. Sthiop). 1. 17, see Lobeck, Aglaoph. p. 651 note) or dat. (Lucian, Demon. 11), some modera commentators (Mey., Alf.) join è $\nu$ $\pi a \nu \tau l$ к. $\tau$. $\lambda$. with the infinitives. This is harsh and somewhat hypercritical ; $\mu \nu \in$ î̃alı appears with a prep. (kaтà) in 3 Macc. ii. 30, and is probably so to be joined here; so Syr., Vulg., Clarom., Goth., and appy. Copt., Eth.
$\pi \epsilon \iota \nu \bar{\alpha} \nu]$ Later form for $\pi \epsilon i \nu \hat{\eta} \nu$, see Winor, Gram. § 13. 3, p. 71, Thom. M. p. 699: 'vulgaris horum verborum scriptura cum ingressu Macedonici ævi, tenuis scaturiginis instar, hic ibi emicat,' Lobeck, Phryn. p. 61. The verb Xop$\tau \dot{\alpha} S \omega$, properly used in ref. to animals (Hesiod, Op. 454, Aristopl. Pax, 176, Plato, Rep. ir. p. 372 d, comp. ix. p. 586 D ), is found always in the N. Test. (except Rev. xix. 21), and very commonly in later writers, in simple ref. to men.
13. $\pi$ d́v $\frac{1}{}$ \{ $\left.\sigma \chi \hat{v} \omega\right]$ ' $I$ can do all things,' - not 'all this,' Hammond on 1 Cor. xiii. 7, 'omnia memorata,' Van Heng., but 'all things,' with the most inclusive reference, marking the transition from the special to the general. Bernard (Serm. Lxxxv.) well says, ' nihil omnipotentiam Verbi clariorem reddit, quam quod omnipotentes facit omnes qui in se [eo] sperant;' see a good sermon on this text by Hammond, Serm, xiv. p. 297 (A.-C. Libr.). חávia is the accus. of the, 'quantitative' object after ioxúw (Gal. v. 6, James v. 16, Wisdom xvi. 20), defining the measure and extent of the action; see Madvig, Synt. § 27.
. $\epsilon \nu \tau \hat{\varphi} \in \dot{\epsilon} \nu \delta \nu \nu$.$] ' in$




Him that giveth me inward strength;' not ' per eum,' Beza, but 'in Him,' in vital and living union with Him who is the only source of all spiritual $\delta \dot{v} \nu a \mu s$; compare 1 Tim. i. 12, 2 Tim. iv. 17, and Ignat. ad Smyrn. § 4. The late form
 Epistles, in Acts ix. 22, and Heb. xi. 34 (see notes on 1 Tim. i. 12), Psalm lii. 7, and eccl. writers. The simple form occurs Col. i. 11, Psalm 1xviii. 31, and is noticed by Lobeck, Phryn. p. 605 note. The interpolation of Xplotê after $\mu \epsilon$ (Rec.) is well supported [D3EFGKL; Bocrn., Syr. (both), Goth., al. ; Gr. Ff.], but seems due to 1 Tim. i. 12, and is rejected by most modern editors.
14. $\pi \lambda \grave{\eta} \nu \kappa . \tau . \lambda$.$] ' Notwithstanding$ ye did well;' clearly not 'ye have done well,' Peile, - the event referred to belonged definitely to the past. In this verse and the following, which in fact present the positive side to the negative oủ $\chi$ ott, verse 11, the apostle guards against any appearance of slighting the liberality of his converts (Chrys., Calv.), by specifying what peculiarly evoked his joy, - the sympathy of the Philippians, $\tau \delta \sigma \cup \gamma \kappa \circ \iota \nu \omega \nu \eta ิ \sigma \alpha l \mu o v \tau \hat{\eta}$ స入 $\lambda i \psi \epsilon \iota$. For the explanation of $\pi \lambda \eta \eta$ see notes on ch. i. 18 , iii. 16 , and for examples of the idiomatic $\kappa \alpha \lambda \omega \hat{s}$ è $\pi$. with a part. (Acts x. 33), see Elsner, Obs Vol. ii. p. 257. $\sigma v \gamma \kappa \circ \iota \nu \omega \nu . \kappa . \tau . \lambda_{\text {.] }}$ ' in that ye communicated, had fellowship, with my affiction,' see notes on Eph. $\mathrm{\nabla} .11$ : specification of their action viewed in its moral

 The action of the participle is contemporaneous with that of the finite rerb (see Bernhardy, Synt. x. 9, p. 383, notes on Eph. i. 9, comp. Winer, Gr. § 45. 6. b, p. 316), and specifies the act in which
the $\kappa a \lambda \omega \bar{\omega}$ ėroın $\quad \sigma \alpha \pi \epsilon$ was evinced. It is scarcely necessary to add that $\uparrow \lambda i \nmid \psi \in t$ is not either here or 2 Cor. viii. 13, 'penurix' ('necessity,' Peile), but simply 'rribulationis,' Vulg. : the gift of the Philipp. is regarded from a higher point of view, as an act of ministering sympathy.
15. oй $\delta a \tau \in \delta$ ह̀ каl $\dot{\jmath} \mu$.] 'Morcover yourselves also know ;' notice of their former liberality in the way of gentle contrast. $\Delta \grave{\varepsilon}$ here does not merely annex an 'enlargement upon' the preceding verse (Peile, 'and,' Scholef.), but passes to earlier acts, which it puts in juxtaposition with the present; see notes on Gal. iii. 8, and Klotz, Devar. Vol. II. p. 356, 362 , who has well discussed this particle, with the single exception that he denies any connection between it and the numeral, which seems philologically certain; Donalds. Cratyl. § 155. The кai suggests a comparison with the apostle, 'ye too, as well as I;' comp. notes on ver. 12.
$\Phi \iota \lambda \iota \pi \pi \dot{\eta} \sigma \iota 0 \imath]$ 'men of Philippi.' The mention by name is emphatic (compare 2 Corin. vi. 11); it does not mark merely affection ('my Philippians,' Bisp.), but specifies them, gratefully and earnestly, as the well remembered and acknowledged doers of the good deed. Beng. goes rather too far when he says, 'innuit antitheton ad alias ecclesias;' the comparison is instituted in what follows.
ö $\tau \in \epsilon \xi \xi \hat{\eta} \lambda$ No 0 ] 'when $I$ went out,' 'quando profectus sum,' Vulg., scil. at the time that event took place. It is doubtful whether the apostle alludes (a) to the assistance supplied to him when at Corinth, and especially mentioned 2 Cor. xi. 9 ; or (b) to that supplied previously to, and possibly at, his departure, Acts xvii. 14. If ( $a$ ), then $\epsilon \xi \hat{\eta} \lambda$ Noo must be regarded as having a pluperfect


reference（Van Heng．，De W．，see Pa－ ley，Ilor．Puzl．vir．3），－an interpreta－ tion to which no serious grammatical ob－ jection can be urged（Jelf，Grum．§ 404， Winer，Grain．§ 40． 5 ；see，however， Fritzsch，de Aor，p．16），but which seems at variance with $\epsilon^{\epsilon} \nu \dot{\alpha} \rho \chi \underline{n}$ रô̂ $\epsilon \dot{u} a \gamma \gamma$ ．， which，as Meyer observes，refers the event to the earliest period of their con－ nection with the apostle．It seems safer， then，to adopt（b）；so Meyer，Alf．，and Bisp．
$\epsilon \kappa \circ \iota \nu \omega \nu \eta \sigma \in \nu$ к．т．入．］＇communicated with（＇deall with，＇ Andrewes）me in regard of the account （ver．17）of giving and receiving；＇eis入órov not being taken in the more lax， yet defensible sense，＇ratione habitâ，＇ Van Heng．（comp． 2 Macc．i．14，Thu－ cyd．iii．46），but，as єis גó ${ }^{\text {a }}$ ，below seems to suggest，in the stricter meaning，＇in ratione dati et accepti，＇Vulg．，Gothic， Copt．；compare Cicero，Lel．xvr．（58）， ＇ratio acceptorum et datorum．＇The exact meaning of the words is slightly doubtful．Chrys．，Theoph．，nearly all the earlier，and the great majority of re－ cent expositors refer the giving and re－

 $\lambda$ í乡 $\psi \omega s \tau \bar{\omega} \nu \pi \nu \in \nu \mu a \tau t \kappa \omega ิ \nu$ ，Chrys．；comp． 1 Cor．ix．11．Grotius and others limit the giving to the Philippians and the re－ ceiving to the apostle；＇ego sum in ves－ tris expensi tabulis，vos in meis accepti．＇ Meyer（followed by Alf．）extends this so far that each party is supposed to open an account with the other，but that the debtor side was vacant in their ac－ count，the creditor in his．This last in－ terpr．seems so artificial，and the first so fairly analogous with the spiritual ap－ plication in ver． 17 ，that we see no reason for departing from the ordinary interpre－ tation；so recently Wiesing．，and Bis－ ping．Examples of the expression $\lambda \hat{\lambda} \psi$ is
kal $\delta 6 \sigma t s$ are cited by Wetstein in loc．； compare also Schoettg．Hor．Vol．I．p． 804．For the construction of кoเע $\omega \nu \epsilon \epsilon$ ， see notes on Gal．vi． 6.

16． $8 \tau$ l］＇because，＇－argumentative （not demonstrative，＇that，＇Paley，Van Heng．，Rilliet，al．），the object of this verse being to justify the statement，द̇ $\nu$ á $\rho \chi \hat{\eta}$ тồ $\epsilon \dot{v} \alpha \gamma \gamma$ ．（ver．15），by noticing a very early period when assistance was sent to the apostle from Philippi．Even before he had left Macedonia they had twice ministered to his necessity：so Goth．（＇unte＇），and perhaps，Vulg．，Cla－ rom．，＇quia：＇the other Vv．are ambig－ uous ；Nth．omits．The other interpre－ tation of $87 \iota$ reverses the order of time， and disturbs the logical sequence．
кal＇̇ $\nu$ © $\Theta \sigma_{-} \sigma_{0}$ ］＇even in Thessalonica，＇ not＇to Thessalonica，＇Vulg．，Claroman．， but，＇when I was in that eity．＇There is here no ellipse of ơvtı（Beza），nor a di－ rect instance of the preposition of rest in combination with a verb of motion（Mey．， Alf．），but only a case of simple and in－ telligible brachylogy，Winer，Gr．§ 50. 4, p．368．The ascensive кal is referred by the early commentators to the impor－ tance of Thessalonica；$\epsilon \lambda \tau \hat{\eta} \mu \eta \tau \rho o \pi \delta \delta\langle\in t$
 $\lambda \epsilon \omega s$ ，Chrys．This is doubtful ；it seems more naturally ascensive in reference to time，＇even at so early a period as when I was at Thessalonica；＇compare Har－ tung，Partik．кal，2．8，Vol．1．p． 135. $\kappa a l$ ä $\pi a \xi$ кal $\delta$ is］＇both once and twice，＇i．e．＇not once only，but twice，＇ emphatic ：see 1 Thessal．i．18，Nehem． xiii．30， 1 Macc．iii．30，and Herod．Ir． 121．2，mir．148．Meyer cites as the an－ tithesis oủ $\chi$ ä $\pi \alpha \xi$ oủdè $\delta i t$ ，Plato，Clitoph． p． 410 в．On каl－кal，see notes on 1 Tin．iv． 10.
$\epsilon$ is $\tau \eta \nu \nu \quad \chi \rho \in[\alpha \nu]$＇to supply my ne－ cessity；eis marking the ethical desti－


nation of the contribution; so eis $\tau \delta$ Ejuary., 2 Corinthians ii. 12, 'to preach the gospel ;' see examples in Winer, Gr. § 49, a, p. 354. The article marks the necessity the apostle then felt, i. e. 'my necessity,' Syr., al. Chrysostom calls attention to the absence of the pronoun,
 $\tau \circ \hat{v} \sigma \epsilon \mu \nu 0 \hat{v}$ è $\pi \mu \epsilon \in \lambda^{\prime} \mu \in \nu \circ 5:$ this is inexact, as the art. fully performs the function of the pronoun; Middl. Art. v. 1. 3.
17. o $\mathfrak{v} \chi$ हi $\tau t$ ] ' not that;' added, as before ver. 11, to avoid a misunderstanding; see notes on ch. iii. 12 ; 'sic laudat Philippensium liberalitatem ut tamen sinistram cupiditatis immodicæ opinionem semper a se rejiciat,' Calvin.
є่ $\pi \iota \zeta \eta \tau \hat{\omega}]$ ' $I$ seele after,' not 'studiose quæro,' Bretschneid., nor even 'insuper quæro,' Van IIeng., who has an claborate, but not persuasive note on this
 only marks the direction of the action, see notes on ch. i. 8, and on 2 Tim. i. 4. In many cases, in this and similar compounds, the directive force is so feebly marked that the difference between the simple and compound is hardly appreciable; compare Winer, de Verb. Comp. 1. 22. Meyer rightly calls attention to the present, - the 'allzcitiges Präsens' of Krüger (Sprachl. §53.1), as marking the regular and characteristic mode of action ; see Bernhardy, Synt. x. 1, p. 370, and compare the English present, in which, however, habitude is more strongly marked than in the Greek; Latham, Eng. Lang. § 507 (ed. 4).
$\tau \delta \delta \delta \mu a]$ ' the gift,' - not exactly ' the gift which they had [now] sent him,' Scholef. Hints, p. 108, but 'the gift in the particular case in question'. (Mcyer, Alford), almost in English idiom 'any gift.' The Coptic [taio] seems to convey the idea of a recompense, 'honora-
rium.' $\quad \dot{a} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \epsilon ̇ \pi \iota \zeta$.] 'but
$I$ do seel,' Alf.: the repetition of the same verb with à àá, as in Rom, viii. 15, Heb. xii. 18 , adds forco and emphasis, and makes the primary meaning of ả $\lambda \lambda \alpha ̀$ ('aliud jam hoc esse de quo sumus dicturi,' Klotz, Devar. Vol. II. p. 1) still more apparent; compare Fritz. Rom. viii. $15 . \quad \tau \delta \nu \kappa \alpha \rho \pi \delta \nu$ к. $\tau . \lambda$.] 'the fruit which alioundeth to your account,' $\dot{\mu} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$, ov̉k द̇ $\mu o \hat{v}$, Chrys. ; i.e. the future divine recompense, which, on every fresh proof of their love, is represented as being laid up to their account, $\delta$ картঠ̀s ėkévols тiktetal, Chrys. As $\pi \lambda \epsilon o \nu \alpha \alpha^{\prime} \epsilon \iota \nu$ appears in all other cases in the N. T. to stand alone ( 2 Thess. i. 3 is doubtful; Alford cites it here as certain, but in his notes in loc. takes it differently), Van Heng. and De W. here connect eis with $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \ \eta \tau \bar{\omega}$. This seems an unnecessary refinement; there is nothing in $\pi \lambda \epsilon o \nu \alpha \dot{\alpha} \zeta \omega$ to render its connection with eis, as marking the destination of the $\pi \lambda \in o v a \sigma \mu \delta \delta$, either ungrammatical or unnatural: it is joined with $\epsilon \nu$ [Plato], Locr. p. 103 A. The use of $\lambda$. 'ros is here the same as in verse 15, not 'habitâ vestrum ratione,' Van Heng., and certainly not $=$ eis v́pâs (Rill.; compare Syr.), but 'in rationem vestram,' Vulg., i. e., dropping all metaphor, $\epsilon i s \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \dot{\jmath} \mu \in \tau$ є́pay owinpiav, Chrys. ; compare Calvin in loc.
18. à $\pi \epsilon ́ \chi \omega$ ठ̀ $\left.\pi \alpha_{\alpha}^{\alpha} \nu \tau \alpha\right]$ 'But I have all I need;' ' though I seek not after the gift, I still have all things in abundance; your liberality has left me to want nothing.' The $\delta$ ' thus retains its proper oppositive force (not 'and now,' Pcile), and preserves the antithesis between the emphatic à $\pi$ é $\chi \omega$ and the foregoing $\mathfrak{\ell} \pi \iota \zeta \eta \tau \omega \hat{\omega}$;
 is neither barely 'habeo,' Vulg., nor yet with any special forensic' sense (accepti-


latio）＇satis habeo，＇＇I give you my ac－ quittance＇Hammond on Mark xiv． 41 ；
 $\tau \delta$ т $\pi \bar{\alpha} \gamma \mu \alpha)$ ，but simply＇acceptum teneo，＇
$\Delta$［accepi］Syr．，Copt．，the prep． $\dot{\alpha} \pi \grave{\delta}$ apparently having a slightly inten－ sive force（＇significat actionis quendam， ut ita dicam，decursum，atque adeo in agendo perseverantiam，＇Winer，Verb． Contp．vi．p．7），and marking the com－ pleteriess and definitive nature of the eै $\chi \in ⿺ 辶$ compare Matth．vi． $2,5,16$ ，Luke vi． 24 ， Philem．15，Arrian，Epict．III． 24 ［p． 228 ，ed．Borh．］$\tau \delta$ خàp $\epsilon \dot{u} \delta \alpha \iota \mu o \nu o \hat{\nu} \nu$ àmé－
 ner，Gr．§40．4，p． 246.
$\kappa \alpha\} \pi \in \rho[\sigma \sigma \in \dot{u} \omega]$＇and abound；＇ex－ pansion and amplification of the preced－ ing àmé $\chi \omega$ ，＇I have all I want and more than all，＇the following $\pi \epsilon \pi \lambda \eta$ f $\omega \mu \mu \iota$ com－ pleting the climax；＇die Hülle und Fülle habe ich，＇Meyer．To supply $\chi \alpha$－ pâs after $\pi \in \pi \lambda \eta$ и́p．（Grot．）is to wholly mar the simplicity and climactic force of the sentence．$\delta \in \xi \dot{\alpha} \mu \in \nu$ os $\kappa . \tau . \lambda$.$] Temporal clause，＇now that I$ have received，＇Peile，＇posteaquam ac－ cepi，＇Erasm．；compare Donalds．G＇r． $\$ 573 \mathrm{sq}$ ．In the following words there is a slight variation of MSS．［A omits
 ter $\dot{v} \mu \bar{\omega} \nu]$ ，caused probably by the recur－ rence of $\pi \alpha p \alpha$ ：there is，however，no dif－
 фро́ठıтоs $\epsilon^{\epsilon} \mu 0$ ，Theodoret．
$\dot{\Delta} \sigma \mu \eta \nu \nu \in \dot{U} \omega \delta\{a s$ ］＇$a$ sweet－smelling sa－ vor：＇accus．in apposition to the preced－ ing $\tau \grave{\alpha} \pi \alpha \rho^{\circ} \dot{v} \mu \bar{\omega} \nu$ ；compare Eph．v．2， and notes in loc．The reference of Alf． to Kühner，Gr．Vol．II．p．146，and the examples cited（Hom．Il．xxiv．735，Eu－ rip．Orest．950）are not quite in point，as the apposition is not to the verbal action contained in the sentence（Jelf，Gram．
§ 580．2）but simply to the accus．tà $\pi a \rho^{\prime}$ $\dot{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ ，which is thus further defined and characterized．It is doubtful whether the gen．$\epsilon$ viwías is to bo considered a gen． materice（W．，Gr．§ 34．2．b，p． 212 note， compare Arist．Rhet．I．11）or a gen．of the characterizing quality（see Scheuerl． Synt．§ 16．3，p．115）；the latter is per－ haps most simple and most in harmony with the Hebraistic tinge which seems to mark these kinds of gen．in the N．T．； compare Winer，Gr．l．c．（text）．
刃v $\mathfrak{i} \alpha \nu$ K．т．$\lambda_{\text {．］}}$＇$a$ sacrifice acceptable （and）well pleasing to God；＇not＇an ac－ cepted sacrifice such as is，＇etc．，Peile， （comp．Syr．）；both adjectives as well as the preced．ng ${ }^{\circ} \sigma \mu \eta \eta \nu \in \dot{\jmath} \omega \delta$ ．（comp．Lev．i． 9,13 ）standing in connection with $\tau \hat{\varphi}$ $\Theta \in \hat{\omega}$ ，which thus falls under the general head of the dative of＇interest；＇see Krüger，Sprachl．§ 48．4．The good deeds which the Philippians did towards the apostle become，from the spirit in which they were done（comp．Chrys．）， an acceptable sacrifice to God Himself． It does not seem necessary with Johnson （Unbl．Sacr．II．4，Vol．1．p． 436 ［A．－C． Libr．］，compare Irenæus，Har．iv．18） to conclude that the alms brought by Epaphr．had heen offered by the people at the altar：the sacrifice of alms is one of the spiritual and evangelical sacrifices specially noticed in the N．T．，e．g．Heb． xiii． 16 ；see the comprehensive list in Watcrland，Doct．of Euch．ch．XII．VoI． Iv．p． 730.

19．$\delta \delta \dot{\epsilon} \Theta \in \delta \delta \mu \circ v$ ］．Not without emphasis and an expression of hopeful trust，＇qui meam agit causam，＇Van Heng．；see notes on chap．i． 3. $\pi \lambda \eta \rho \dot{\omega} \sigma \in t \quad \kappa . \quad \tau . \lambda$.$] ＇shall fulfil（with$ reciprocating reference to $\pi \epsilon \pi \lambda$ ．ver．18） every need of yours；＇not in the form of
 hopeful promise，the future $\pi \lambda \eta p \omega \sigma \in t$ be－

 aî̀vas т $\hat{\nu} \nu$ aíćv$\omega \nu, a \dot{a} \mu \dot{\nu} \nu$.

ing distinctly predictive ; compare Rom. xvi. 20, 2 Cor. xiii. 11,2 Tim. iv. 18.
 mss.; Vulg., Clarom., al.], followed by Theod., Theophylact, seems clearly a gloss. It is doubtful whether $\chi$ peiav is to be referred solely to temporal (Chrys.), or solely to spiritual (Theodor.) wants. The use of $\chi \rho$ eía and the preceding allusions are in favor of the former ; the use of $\pi \lambda_{0}$ ovtos and the immediate context, of the latter: the inclusive form of the expression seems to justify our uniting both. $\hat{\epsilon}^{\prime} \nu \delta \delta \xi \eta$ ] 'in glory ;' not so much an instrumental (Meyer, Alf.) as a modal clause, closely in union with è $\mathrm{X} \rho$., the former pointing to the manner in which God will supply their wants, - not, however, merely ' magnifice, splendide,' Calv. (compare Beng.), but with reference to the element or the attribute in which the action will be evinced, -white èv $\mathrm{X} \rho$. 'I $\eta \sigma$. specifies the ever-blessed sphere in which alone all is realized ; see notes on Ephes. ii. 7. So apparently Chrys., oưTん $\pi \in \rho / \sigma \sigma \in \dot{v} \in z$
 Grotius and others (comp. Æth.) connect $\hat{\epsilon} \nu \delta \delta \bar{\xi}$ ! with $\pi \lambda$ (ov̂ros; this is grammatically admissible, - the expression
 ing the omission of the article (see notes on Eph. i. 15), - and certainly deserves consideration, but the remark of Meyer, that $\pi \lambda$ oôros is always used in the N. T. in such metaphorical expressions with a gen. of the thing (Rom. ii. 4, ix. 23, 2 Cor. viii. 2, Ephes. i. 7, 18, ii. 7, iii. 16, Col. i. 27), and that we should have ex-
 seems to strike the balance in favor of $\pi \lambda \eta \rho$. è $\nu \delta \delta \xi \xi \eta$ : so apparently Syr., but
these are cases in which the $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{r}}$. cannot safely be adduced on either side.
$\kappa \alpha \tau \grave{\alpha} \tau \grave{c} \pi \lambda$.] !according to,' i. e. 'in accorlance with the riches He has;' compare notes on Eph. i. 5. The clause involves a shade of modal reference, and
 тaxtes тоєìv, Chrys.
20. © $\Theta$ फ кal $\pi a \tau \rho!]$ 'to God and our Father ;' anticipatory doxology celled forth by the preceding words. On the august title $\Theta$ eds кal $\pi a \tau \eta \dot{p}$, see notes on Gal. i. 4.

ทो $\delta \measuredangle \xi a]$ Scil. $\epsilon{ }^{\ell} \eta$, not $\check{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \omega$; see notes on Ephesians i. 2. The article seems here to have its 'rhetorical' force (Bernhardy, Synt. vi. 22, p. 315), and to mark the $\delta 0$ $\xi \mathrm{c} \alpha$ as that 'which especially and peculiarly belongs to God;' see notes on Gal. i. 5, where this and the following expression, cis тò̀s aic̄pas $\tau \omega ิ \nu$ aicuvav, are briefly investigated. On the two formulæ aì̀ $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$
 less on Eph. iii. 21, with however the qualifying remarks in notes in loc.
 not ' omnes sanctos,' Syr., Copt., 庣th., but 'omnem sanctum,' Vulg., Clarom.: it does not apply to the whole Church, but, as Beng. suggests, individualizes; each one is specially saluted; so Conyb., Wies., Alf. On the term äybos and its application in the N.T., see notes on Eph. i. 1. It is doubtful whether ${ }^{2} \nu \mathrm{X} \rho$. is to be joined with $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \pi \dot{\alpha} \sigma \alpha \sigma \vartheta \in$ (compare Rom. xvi. 22, 1 Corin. xvi. 19) or with a 710 v (ch. i. 1); the former is adopted by Syr. (plural) and Theod. ( $\delta \tau \hat{\varphi}$ Kvpí $\omega$ 'In $\eta \sigma \hat{0} \pi / \sigma \tau \varepsilon \dot{u} \omega \nu)$; the latter by Mey. and several modern interpreters. As a zyos is connected in this Epistle with è $\mathrm{X} \rho$. (comp. Rom. xvi. 3, 8, 9, 10, 13), and


 $\pi \nu \epsilon \dot{\prime} \mu a \tau o s ~ \dot{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$.
as $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha}$. does not appear elsewhere used with ${ }_{\epsilon} \nu \mathrm{X} \rho$. or ${ }^{e} \nu \mathrm{X} \rho$. ${ }^{\prime} \mathrm{I} \eta \sigma$., but only with È $\nu u p i(\omega$, the latter is perhaps slightly the most probable.
oi $\sigma \dot{v} \nu \quad \epsilon \mu 0\} \grave{a} \delta \dot{\delta} \in \lambda \phi 0]$ Those who were more immediately in communication with the apostle, suitably and naturally specified before the inclusive $\pi$ dévess of äyoo in the following verse. The apparent difficulty between this and ch. ii. 20, is simply disposed of by Chrys., ou

22. $\mu \alpha \dot{\alpha} \lambda \iota \sigma \tau \alpha]$ 'especially;' they were naturally more in contact with the aposthe than the other Christians at Rome, who were not among his immediate associates. The primary force of $\mu \dot{\alpha} \lambda \iota \sigma \tau \alpha$ is alluded to in notes on 1 Tim. iv. 10.
of èк $\tau \hat{\eta} s \mathrm{~K}$. oikias] 'thuse of Cicsar's household.' These words have received various interpretations. It seems most natural to regard them as denoting, not on the one hand, merely 'the Pretorian guards' (Matth.), nor on the other, the 'members of Nero's family' (comp. 1 Cor. i. 16), Camer., Van Heng., and more recently, and it is to be feared with obvious reasons, Baur (Apost. Paulus, p. 470), 一 who founds on this interpretation an argument against the genuineness of the Ep., -but simply the oikeiou (Theod.), the servants and retainers belong-
ing to the emperor's household; see Krebs, Obs. p. 332, Loesn. Obs. p. 358. It may thus seem not improbable that St. Paul was in confinement in or near to that barrack of the Prextorians which was attached to the palace of Nero (Hows. St. Paul, Vol. II. p. 510, ed. 2), but it does not necessarily follow that трaitcópiov in ch. i. 13 (see notes) is to be restricted to that smaller portion. The barracks within the walls were probably in constant communication with the camp without. See an interesting paper by Lightfoot, Journ. Class. Philol. 1857 (March), p. 58 sq .
23. $\mu \in \tau \alpha \tau \circ \hat{v} \pi \nu \in \dot{u} \mu$.] 'with your spirit;' the 'potior pars' of our cornposite nature, the third and highest constituent of man: see notes on Gal. vi. 18, and on 2 Tim. iv. 22. The reading is not very doubtful : the more usual $\mu \epsilon \tau \grave{\alpha}$ $\pi d \nu \tau \omega \nu \dot{v} \mu \bar{\omega} \nu$ is not strongly supported [KL ; many mss.; Syriac (both), al.; Chrys., Theod.], while the text has decided external evidence [ABDEFG; 17. 67.** 73. 80; Vulg., Clarom., Coptic, Eth. (Platt); many Ff.], and does not seem so likely to have been changed from $\pi d \dot{d} \tau \omega \nu \hat{v}^{\dot{\mu} \mu \mathrm{\omega} \nu}$ as the converse. The addition of $\grave{\eta} \mu \omega \hat{\nu}$ after Kupiov [Rec. with DE; Coptic, al.] has still less critical support.

## TIIE EPISTLE TO TIIE COLOSSIANS.

## INTRODUCTION.

The profound and difficult Epistle to the Colossians was written by the apostle during his first captivity at Rome (Acts xxviii. 16 ; compare Introd. to 1 Tim.), and, as far as we can gather from some of the expressions in the concluding chapter (ver. 3, 4), at a period of that captivity, when the apostle's anticipations were not of so grave a character as they appear to us in the Epistle to the Philippians (ch. i. 20, 21, 30, ii. 27 ; see Introd. to l’hilipp.), and when his restraint was probably less close (comp. Acts xxviii. 16 sq.) and his treatment more merciful (comp. ch. iv. 8 sq.).

We may thus not improbably place it first in the thirl of the four groups (the Epistles of the first captivity) into which St. Paul's Epistles may be conveniently divided, and conceive it to have been written a very short time before the Epistle to the Ephesians, and perhaps about the early part of the year A.D. 62. It was conveyed to the church of Colosse by Tychicus (ch. iv. 7,8 ), who had received a similar commission with reference to the converts at Ephesus (Eph. vi. 21), and it not improbably reached its destination before the Epistle to the last-mentioned Church; comp. Meyer, Komment. iub. Eph. p. 17.

The Epistle seems to have been called forth by the information St. Paul had received from Epaphras (ch. iv. 12; Philem. 23), who, if not the actual founder of the Church of Colossec (Davidson, Introd. Vol. II. p. 405), was most certainly one of the very earliest preachers of Christ in that city ; compare ch. i. 7 and notes in loc. Its object transpires very clearly, - an earnest desire on the part of the apostle to warn the Colossians against a system ot false teaching, partly Oriental and theosophistic in its character (ch. ii. 18), and partly Judaical and ceremonial (ch. ii. 16), which was tending on the one hand directly to obscure the majesty and glory of Christ (comp. ch. i. 15, ii. 8 sq.), and on the other, to introduce ritualistic observances, especially on the side of bodily austerities (ch. ii. $16-23$ ), opposed alike to the simplicity and freedom of the gospel, and to all true and vital union with the risen Lord (ch. ii. 19, iii. 1). For further particulars see Davidson, Introd. Vol. II. p.

407 sq ., where the sects to which these cormupters of the faith have been sup. posed to belong, and the peculiar nature of their tenets are very carefully discussed ; comp. also Smith, Dict. of Bible, Art. 'Ep. to the Colossians,' Vol. I. p. 342 .

In reference to the genuineness and authenticity of this Epistle it may be said briefly that no doubts have been urged that deserve any serious consideration. Even if the external testimonies had been less clear and explicit than we find them to be (Irenæus, Her. III. 14. 1, Clem.-Alex. Strom. i. p. 325 , ed. Pott, Tertull. de Prcescr. cap. 7, Origen, contr. Cels. v. 8), the internal arguments derived from the peculiarities of style and expression, must have been pronounced by every sagacious critic as final and unanswerable. To class such an Epistle, so marked not only by distinctive peculiarities of style, but by the nerve, force, and originality of its argument, with the vague productions of later Gnosticism (Mayerhoff, Baur, al.) is to bewray such a complete want of critical perception that we can scarcely wonder that such riews have been both very generally and very summarily rejected; see Meyer, Einleitung, p. 7, Davidson, Introd. Vol. Ir. p. 427 sq. As the latter writer very justly observes, the fabrication of such an Epistle would be 'a phenomenon perfectly inexplicable, ( $\mathrm{p} \cdot 428$ ).

The similarity between many portions of this Epistle and that to the Ephesians has often been noticed, and the claim to priority of composition much debated. With regard to the first point it may be again observed (see Introtl. to Eph.) that the two Epistles were written closely about the same time, and addressed to two Churches sufficiently near to one another to have had many points of resemblance, and to have needed very similar forms of exhortation, especially in reference to the duties of social and domestic life. With regard to the second point it may be enough to say that the nature of the contents of the two Epistles seems to harmonize best with the opinion that the Epistle to the Colossians was first in order, and that the more directly individualizing and polemical preceded the more directly systematic and doctrinal; see Davidson, Introd. Vol. Ir. p. 346 sq., and compare notes on Eph. vi. 21.

## TIIE EPISTLE TO TIIE COLOSSIANS.

## CHAPTER I.

Apostolic address and salutation.

$\Pi$ AYAOE äтóvтo入os Xpıбтô̂ 'I $\eta \sigma o \hat{v}$ 

Chapter I. 1. $\alpha \pi \delta \delta \sigma \tau$. X $\rho$. 'I $\eta \sigma$.] ' an apostle of Jesus Christ ;' the (possessive) genitive denoting whose minister ho was : see notes on Eph. i. 1, and for the meanings of $\dot{\alpha} \pi$ óvтo入os, here obviously in its higher and more especial sense, see notes on Gal. i. 1, and on Eph. iv. 11. The form of greeting in this Ep. closely resembles that to the Ephesians; there are, however, as has been previously observed (compare notes on Eph. i. 1, and see Rück. on Gal. i. 1), some differences in the addresses of St. Paul's Epistles, especially in the apostle's designation of himself, which, though not in all cases easy to account for, can hardly be deemed accidental. We may thus classify these designations: in 1 Thess. and 2 Thess., simply Пầरos; in Philemon (very appropriately), $\delta \epsilon \in \sigma-$ mos X X . ' $\mathbf{I}$. ; in Phil., סov̂גos ©єov̂ (associated with Timothy) ; in Titus, $\delta o \hat{u} \lambda$.

 Cor. $\left\langle\kappa \lambda \eta \tau \partial s a^{2} \pi\right.$. Tisch., Rec., but not certain), 2 Cor., Ephes., Col,, 2 Tim.,

 $\tau \hat{\eta} p o s \hat{\eta}_{\eta} \mu \hat{\nu} \mathrm{\kappa}$ к.l X. 'I. к. $\tau . \lambda_{\text {. }}$; and lastly, with fullest titular distinction, in Galat.,
 $\kappa$ к т. $\lambda$. An interesting paper might be written on these peculiarities of designation. òta $2 \in \lambda \dot{h} \mu a \tau o s$ $\Theta \in o \hat{\nu}]$ Added, probably, in thankful remembrance of God's grace, and in feelings of implicit obedience to His will; see notes on Eph. i. $1 . \quad$ каl T $\iota \mu . \delta \dot{a} \delta \in \lambda \phi$.] Timothy is similarly associated with the apostle in his greeting in 2 Cor. i. 1, Philem. 1, and, even more conjointly as to form of association, Phil. i. 1, 1 Thess. i. 1, 2 Thess. i. 1 : so also Sosthenes, 1 Cor. i. 1, compare Gal. i. 2, and see notes in loc. It may be observed, however, that in 1 Cor, Phil., and Philem., the apostle proceeds in the singular, while here, 2 Cor. i. 3 (see Meyer), 1 and 2 Thessalon., he continues the address in the plural; see below, notes on ver. 3. It has been supposed that Timothy was also the transcriber of the Epistle (Steiger, Bisp.; compare ch. iv. 18) : this is possible, but nothing more. The title $\delta$ áde $\lambda \phi \delta \delta s$, as in 1 Cor. i. 1, 2 Cor. i. 1 , has no special
 Chrys.), but simply to Christian brotherhood; Timothy was one of oi ả $\delta \in \lambda \phi 0$, ' der christliche-Mitbruder,' De Wette.

##  

2．Ko入a $\sigma \sigma \alpha \hat{\imath}$ ］So Rec．（but not Elz．），Lachm．，and Tisch．，with AB（C in subscr．）K ；more than 40 mss ．S Syr．（both），Copt ；Fthiop．（Platt），Slav．（mss．）； Origen，Theod．，Chrysost．（mss．），Theophyl．（mss．），Suidas，al．，to which may be added mss．in Herod．vir． 30 and Xenoph．Anal，r．2，6．The more usual mode of spelling is found in BDEFGL；numerous mss．；Vulg．，Claroman．，al．；Clem．， Chrys．，Theodoret（mss．），al．；Lat．Ff．（Rec．，Meycr，al．）．It can be proved by coins that the latter was the correct form（Eckhel，Doctr．Num．InI．147）；still the external authority，especially as seen in the Vv．，seems so strong，that Ko入aб⿱ais can hardly be referred to a mere change of vowels in transcription found only in two or three of the leading MSS．，but must be regarded as the，not improbably， provincial mode of spelling in the time of St．Paul．So too Meyer，who admits that Koлоббаis was an old emendation．

2．Ko入a，$\sigma \alpha \hat{\iota} s$ ］Colossæ or Colas－ sæ（see crit．note）was a city of Phrygia， on the Lycus（an affluent of the Mrean－ der），near to，and nearly equidistant from the more modern cities of Hierapo－ lis and Laodicea．It was anciently a place of considerable importance（ $\pi$ ódis $\mu \in \gamma \alpha ́ \lambda \eta$ ，Herod．vir． 30 ；$\pi o ́ \lambda ı s ~ o i k o v \mu e ́ v \eta, ~$ є $\dot{\delta} \alpha$ aí $^{\prime} \omega \nu$ каl $\mu \epsilon \gamma \dot{\lambda} \lambda \eta$ ，Xenoph．Anab．1． 2. 6），but subsequently so declined in com－ parison with the commercial city of Apa－ mea on the one side，and the strong， though somewhat shattered city of La－ odicea on the other（ $\alpha i \quad \mu \in \gamma i \sigma \tau \alpha l \tau \omega \bar{\omega} \kappa \alpha \tau \alpha$ $\tau \grave{\eta} \quad \Phi \rho v \gamma i a \nu \pi \dot{\partial} \lambda \epsilon \omega \nu$ ），as to be classed by Strabo（Geogr．xıy．8．13，ed Kramer） only among the mo八íquata of Phrygia， though still，from past fame，classed by Pliny（Nat．Hist．v．41）among the＇cel－ eberrima oppida＇of that country；see Steiger，Einl．§ 2，p．17．It afterwards rose again in importance，and under the name of X $\mathbf{~} \nu$ aı（Theophylact）again re－ ceived the titles of $\epsilon \dot{v} \delta a i \mu \omega \nu$ and $\mu \epsilon \gamma \dot{\lambda} \lambda \eta$ （Nicetas，Chon．p．203，ed．Bonn）．It has been supposed to have occupied the site of the modern Chonas or Khonos， but of this there now seem considerable doubts；see Smith，Dict．Geogr．s．v．， Conyb．and Hows．St．Paul，Vol．II．p． 471 note，Pauly，Real－Encycl．Vol．II．p． 518，and the very interesting topograph－
ical notes of Steiger，Einl．p．1－33． á $\gamma\left[\begin{array}{l}\text { os }] \text {＇suints；＇used substantivally，as }\end{array}\right.$ appy．in all the addresses of St．Paul＇s Epp．，Rom．i．7， 1 Cor．i．1， 2 Cor．i． 1，Eph．i．1，Phil．i． 1 ；so Copt．，Eth． （Platt），and appy．Chrys．De W．and others connect à ${ }^{\text {rious with }} \mathfrak{\alpha} \delta \in \lambda \phi$ ．（so ap－ parently Syriac，Vulg．），but with cou－ siderably less plausibility，as in such a case $\pi$ to $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ ois would far more naturally precede than follow，the more compre－ hensive áylous．On the meaning of äytos in such addresses，see Davenant in loc．， Beveridge，Serm．Ir．Vol．vi．p．401，and compare notes on Eph．i．1．
$\pi \iota \sigma \tau$ ois $\dot{\alpha} \delta \in \lambda \phi \circ$ îs к．$\tau . \lambda$.$] ＇fuith－$ ful brethren in Christ；＇more specific， and slightly explanatory，designation of the preceding ä $\gamma \iota o$ ．＇Ev X $\mathrm{X} \iota \sigma \tau \hat{\psi}$ is in close union with $\dot{\alpha} \delta \in \lambda \phi \circ$ í，and marks the sphere and element in which the broth－ erhood existed．The omission of the article is perfectly admissible，${ }^{\prime} \nu \mathrm{X} \rho$ ．be－ ing associated with $\dot{\alpha} \delta \bar{\delta} \in \lambda \phi 0 \hat{\iota} s$ so as to form，as it were，one composite idea； see Winer，Gr．§ 20.2 ，p．123，and notes on Eph．i．15．The insertion of the ar－ ticlo would throw a greater emphasis on ${ }^{e} \dot{y} y \mathrm{X} \rho$ ．，＇iisque in Christo，＇than is neces－ sary or intended；see notes on 1 Tim． iii．14，Gal．iii．26．Lachm．adds＇Inooû with AD $^{1} \mathrm{E}^{1} \mathrm{FG} ; 3$ mss．；Syriac，Copt。

We thank God for your faith, and love, and progress in the gospel as preached to you by Epaphras.
 $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ 'I $\eta \sigma \sigma \hat{v} X \rho \iota \sigma \tau o \hat{v}, \pi a ́ \nu \tau о \tau \epsilon \pi \epsilon \rho i \quad$ ن $\mu \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \rho \circ \sigma-$
(not Eth.), al., but, considering the probability of insertion, not on sufficient authority. It may be observed that here, Rom. i. 7, Eph. i. 1, and Phil. i. 1, the apostle does not write especially to the Church (1 Cor. i. 1, 2 Cor. i. 1, Gal. i. 2 (plural), 1 Thess. i. 1, and 2 Thess. i. 1), but to the Christians collectively. This is perhaps not intentionally significant ; at any rate it can hardly be conceived that he only uses the title $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \kappa \kappa \lambda \eta-$ $\sigma\{\alpha$ to those churches which he had himself founded: see Meyer in loc.
$\chi \alpha{ }^{\alpha} \rho เ s \kappa . \tau . \lambda$.] On this blended form of the modes of Occidental and Oriental salutation, sce notes on Gal. i. 3, Eph. i. 2. The term $\chi$ ápos is elaborately explained by Davenant; it seems enough to say with Waterland Euchar. x., that $\chi$ ápes 'in the general signifies 'favor,' 'mercy,' 'indulgence,' 'bounty;' in particular it signifies' a gift, and more especially a 'spiritual gift,' and in a sense yet more restrained, the gift of sanctification, or of such spiritual aids as may enable a man both to will and do according to what God has commanded,' Works, Vol.'IV. p. 666.
$\pi \alpha \tau \rho \delta s \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu]$ The addition каl Kup. 'I.X. adopted by Rec. with ACEG; mss. ; Vulg. (ed.), Syr.-Phil., - but with asterisk, Bocrn., al. ; Gr. Ff, appears rightly rejected by Lachm., Tisch., and most modern editors.
3. $\epsilon \mathcal{v} \chi a \rho t \sigma \tau 0 \hat{v} \mu \in \nu]$ 'we give thanks;' i.e. I and Timothy. In this Ep., as in 2 Cor., the singular and plural are both used (see ch. i. 23, 24, 28, 29; ii. 1 ; iv. $2,3,4,13$ ), and sometimes, as in ch. i. 25,28 , iv. 3,4 , even in juxtaposition : in all cases the context seems fully to account for and justify the appropriateness of the selection ; see Meyer on 2 Cor. i. 4. It is doubtful whether $\pi \alpha \dot{\nu} \tau о \tau \epsilon$ is to bo joined (a) with the finite verb
(1 Cor. i. 4, 2 Thess. i. 3, comp. Eph. i. 16), or (b) with the participle (compare Rom. i. 10, Phil. i. 4) : Syr., Eth., and the majority of modern commentators adopt the former ; the Greek expositors and apparently Copt. and Vulg, the latter. As $\pi \in \rho l$ v $\mu \omega \hat{\nu}$ would seem a very feeble commencement to the participial clause, $(b)$ is to be preferred : see Alf. in loc., who has well defended this latter construction. On єù $\chi a p \iota \sigma \tau \in i \nu$, sce notes on ch. i. 12, and on Phil. i. 3.
The reading is very doubtful. Rec. inserts kal before $\pi a r \rho$, with $\mathrm{AC}^{2} \mathrm{D}^{3} \mathrm{EKL}$; al.: Lachmann inserts $\tau \hat{\varphi}$ with D1FG; Chrys. : Tisch. adopts simply $\pi a \tau \rho l$ with BC . As the probability of an insertion, especially of the familiar $\kappa a l(\mathrm{Eph}$. i. 3, al.), seems very great, we retain, though not with perfect confidence, the reading of Tisch. The anarthrous use of $\pi a \tau \eta \eta_{p}$ is fully admissible ; see the list in Winer, Gr. § 19. 1, p. 109 sq.
$\pi \in \rho \ \dot{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \pi \rho \circ \sigma$.$] 'praying for you.'$ The uncial authorities are here again nearly equally divided between $\pi \epsilon \rho$ ! [AC $\mathrm{D}^{3} \mathrm{E}^{2} \mathrm{KL}$ ] and vimép [BD1E1FG]: the former is adopted by Tisch. and most modern editors, and on critical grounds is to be preferred, though grammatically considered the difference is extremely slight, if indeed appreciable, compare Fritz. Rom. Vol. I. p. 25 sq. .The utmost perhaps that can be said is that vi $\pi \in \dot{\rho}$ seems to direct the attention more to the action itself, $\pi \in \rho l$ more to the object or circumstances towards which it is directed, or from which it may be supposed to emanate : see notes on Gal. i. 4. On the primary meaning and etymolog. affinities of $\pi \in \rho$ l, see Donalds. Cratyl. § 177, 178.
4. áкои́ $\sigma a \nu \tau \in s$ ] 'having heard; i.e.



postquam ;' temporal use of the participlo (Donalds. Gr. § 575), not causal, ' 'quoniam andivimus,' Calv. It was not the hearing but the substance of what he heard that caused the apostle to give thanks. For examples of the union of two or more participles with a single finite verb, see Winer, Gram. § 45. 3, p. 30s. $\quad \dot{\epsilon} \nu \mathrm{X} \rho$. 'I $\eta \sigma$. ] 'in Christ Jesus,' - in Him, as the sphere or substratum of the $\pi$ iocrus, that in which the faith centres itself. The omission of the article gives a more complete unity to the conception, 'Cluist-centred faith,' see notes on Eph. i. 15, and comp. Fritz. Rom. iii. 25, Vol. 1. p. 195, note. חírтıs, as usual, has its subjective meaning; not 'externam fidei professionem,' nor both this and 'internam et sinceram in corle habitantem fidem' (Davenant), but simply the latter; compare notes on Gal. i. 23.
$\xi_{\nu} \nu \varepsilon \notin \chi \in \tau \epsilon$ Further statement of the direction and application of the $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \dot{d} \pi \eta$. The difference between this and $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ eis (Rec.) is slight, but appreciable. The latter simply appends a second moment of thought ('amorem, eumque erga omnes sanctos'), the former draws attention to it, and
 oneréiouv, Theodor. The reading of Rec. is, however, very fecbly supported [D3 ${ }^{3} \mathrm{E}^{2} \mathrm{KL}$; al.] and rejected by all recent editors.
5. $\delta 1 \dot{\alpha} \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \quad \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \pi i \delta \alpha$ is most naturally connected with the preceding relative sentence, not with eixap., Davenant, Eadie; for, as Meyer justly remarks, this preliminary euxapıotia is always, in St. Paul's Epistles (Rom. i. 8, 1 Cor: i. 4, Eph. i. 15, Phil. i. 5, 1 Thess. i. 3, 2 Thessalon. i. 3, 2 Tim. i. 5, Philem. 4), grounded on the subjective state of his converts, àkoúvavтes к. т. $\lambda$. The love they entertained toward the žrot was
evoked and conditioned by no thought of any carthly return-(compare Calvin), but by their hope for their $\mu$ uovos in

 $\tau \grave{~} \mu \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \lambda o \nu \tau a$ à $\gamma a v \alpha ́$, Theoph. ; so Chrys. and Theodoret. $\tau$ 方
 up for you in heaven,' 'propter coelestem beatitudinem,' Daven. This defining elause, as well as the following words, seem to show that the $\dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \pi l^{2}$ must here be regarded, if not as purely objective, 'id quod speratur,' Grot., yet certainly as under objective aspects (comp. Rom. viii. 24 , ह̇ $\lambda \pi$ is $^{\beta} \beta \lambda \in \pi o \mu e ́ v \eta$, and perlhaps

 compare notes on Eph. i. 18. It is characterized as т $\grave{\nu} \nu$ àmoк. к. т. $\lambda$. partly to
 Chrys.), partly its futurity (see notes on 2-Tim. iv. 8), - the àd denoting the setting apart, by itself, for future purposes or wants ; compare Joseph. Antiq.
 ù $\eta \mu e ́ v a v$, Xen. Anab. 1I. 3. 5, aí $\beta$ á̉avoı
 examples in Kypke, Obs. Vol. ir. p. 320. $\pi \rho \circ \eta \kappa \circ \dot{\sim} \sigma a \tau \epsilon]$ ' $y e$ heard before:' before when? Not heforo its fulfilment, 'respectu spoi quæ illis do re futurâ erat facta,' Wolf, - which would leave the compound form very unmeaning ; nor yet specifically before this Epistle was written, 'ante quam scriberem,' Beng., but simply and generally, 'formerly,' Steiger, Alf., - i. e. not before any definite epoch (e.g. 'when you received this hope,' Meyer, al.), but merely at some undefined period in the past, 'prius [shorp] audistis,' Coptic; compare Herodot. v. 86, où троакпкоо́бь
 акһ̆коє : ̈̈兀ь; compare Plato, Legg. vix. p.



797 A ．The verb is often found with a purely local sense；e．g．Xenoph．Mem． II．4．7，where see Kühner．
$\tau \hat{\psi} \lambda \delta \gamma \omega \tau \hat{\eta} s \dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \hat{\eta}$ ．］＇the word of Truth；＇not the gen．of quality（＇veris－ simum，＇Grot．），but the gen．of the sub－ stance or content（Scheuerlein，Synt．§ 12. 1，p．82），т $\hat{\jmath} \mathrm{a}$ à $\eta \lambda \uparrow \epsilon$ éas specifying what was the substance and purport of its teaching；see notes on Eph．i．13．The genitive evaraye入 ${ }^{\text {lov }}$ is usually taken as the genitive of apposition to $\tau \hat{\varphi} \lambda \hat{\gamma} \gamma \omega \tau \bar{\eta} s$ д̀ $\lambda \eta$ クั．（De Wette，Olsh．）；but it seems more simple to regard it as a defining genitive allied to the genitive possessivus （genitive continentis），which specifies，and， so to say，localizes the general notion of the governing substantive，－＇the truth which was preached in and was an－ nounced in the gospel ；＇compare notes on Eph．i．13，and see examples in Wi－ ner，$G r .30 .2$ ．In Gal．ii．5，14，the gen．ejug ．is somewhat different，as
 whereas here it is under the regimen of， and serves to characterize，a preceding substantive．

6．тồ $\pi \alpha \rho \delta \nu \tau o s \in$ is $\dot{v} \mu$ ．］＇which is present with you ；．＇more exactly＇which came to and is present with you，＇the eis （not $\epsilon \nu$ as in the next clause）conveying the idea of the gospel having reached them（Jelf，Gr．§ 625），while тapóvzos implies that it abides there ；ở $\pi a \rho \in \gamma^{\prime} \nu$－
 ：Ё́vtv ėnєî，Chrys．For examples of this not very uncommon union of verbs of rest with eis or $\pi$ mós（Acts xii．20），sec Winer，Gr．§ 50．4，pp．368，369．A －somewhat extreme case occurs in Jer．

каs̀ बेs kal к．т．入．］＇even as it also is in the whole world；＇тavtaxoù кратє̂̂， Curys．，－a very natural and intelligible hyperbole；compare Rom．i．18，x． 18.

It is obviously not necessary either to limit $\kappa \delta \sigma \mu o s$ to the Roman empire（ $\mathrm{Mi}-$ chael．），or to understand it with a literal exactness，which at this period could not be substantiated ；comp．Orig．in Muth． Tract．xxyili．，and see Justiniani in loc． $\kappa a l$ Є้ $\sigma \tau \iota \nu \kappa a \rho \pi \circ \phi . \kappa . \tau . \lambda$.$] ＇ a n d$ is bearing fruit and increasing；＇metaphor from trees or arborescent plants（Chrys．， Just．；compare Meyer）depicting the inward and intensive，as well as outwari and extensive progress of the gospel．It may be observed that the apostle does not merely append a parallel participle каl картофороинévov，but by a studied change to the finite verb（see on Eph．i． 20，Winer，Gr．§63．2．b，p．505）throws an emphasis on the fuct of the картофо－ pia，while by his u：e of the periphrastic present（not картофореî＇fructificat，＇ Vulg．，but＇est fructificans，＇Clarom．） he gives further prominence to the idea of its present continuance and duration ； see Winer，Gr．§ 45．5，p．311．The distinction between the two verbs has been differently explained：on the whole Greek commentators seem．right in re－ ferring картоф，to the inner and personal， aủ，to the outward and collective in－ crease ；картофорíav．тои̂ є̀̀arү．кє́кл $\eta \kappa є$ т $\grave{\nu} \pi i ́ \sigma \tau \iota \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ ảкทкоб́т $\omega \nu$ каl $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu$＇̇ $\pi a \iota-$
 $\tau \in \cup \delta \partial \tau \omega \nu$ тठ $\pi \lambda \hat{\eta}$ సेos，Theod．：compare Acts vi．7，xii．24，xix．20．The middle
 it may perhaps be an instance of the ＇dynamic＇middle（Donalds．Gr．§ 432. 2．b6，Krüger，Sprachl．§ 52．8），and may mark some intensification of the active， ＇fructus suos exserit ；＇：compare èvep $\epsilon \in \mathfrak{i}-$ Grat，Gal．v．6，and notes in loc．The reading is somewhat doubtful ：wal av̀ $\xi$ ．， with $A B C D^{1} E^{1} E G L$ ，scems to rest on preponderant evidence，but the authori－ ties for the omission［ABCDiEl；Copti，




Sah．］，or insertion［D2 ${ }^{3} \mathrm{E}^{2}$ FGKL； Vulg．，Claroman．，Syr．（both），Exth．］of the first kai，owing to the great prepon－ derance of the Vr ．on the latter side， are nearly equally balanced．On the whole it seems more likely to have been omitted to modify the hyperbole than in－ serted to preserve the balance of the sen－ tence ；so Tisch．，Mey．，and De W． $\left.\tau \dot{\eta} \nu \chi^{\alpha} \rho เ \nu \tau 0 \hat{v} \Theta \in 0 \hat{\nu}\right]$＇the grace of God，＇i．e．as evinced and manifested in the gospel：＇amplificat hisce verbis effi－ caciam evangelii．．．．．．evangelium vo－ luntatem Dei salvantem ostendit，et nobis gratiam in Christo offert，＇Daven．；com－ pare Tit．ii．15．It is doubtful whether this accus．is to be connected（a）with both verbs（Do Wette），or（b）only with èrє́ $\gamma \nu \omega \tau \in$（Mey．）．The grammatical se－ quence appears to suggest the former， and is apparently followed by Chrysost．，
 but the logical connection certainly the latter ；for if $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \lambda$ ．were joined with
 low）$\kappa$ ．$\tau$ ．$\lambda$ ．in verse 7 would seem tau－ tologous．On the whole it seems best to adopt（b）；so Steiger，Mey．，al．
$\dot{\epsilon} \nu \vec{\alpha} \lambda \eta \hat{N} \in\{\alpha]$＇in truth；＇i．e．in no Judaistic or Gnostic form of teaching ；
 naturally to suggest）an adverbial defi－ nition of the manner appended to the pre－ ceding è $\pi \epsilon ́ \gamma \nu \omega \tau \epsilon$ ；compare Matth．xxii． 16，and see Winer，Gr．§ 51.1, p． 377 （comp．p．124），Bernhardy，Synt．v．8， p．211．Alford objects to the adverbial solution，but adopts an interpretation， ＇in its truth and with true knowledge，＇ that does not appreciably differ from it． Both Chrys．and Theoph．（ov̀к $\dot{\epsilon}^{\boldsymbol{v}} \boldsymbol{\lambda} \lambda \dot{\sigma} \gamma \omega$ ，
 given to $\dot{e} \nu$ more of an instrumental force ：this is not grammatically neces－
sary，and has led to the doubtful para－
 סб́soss，Theophyl．

7．$\kappa a \uparrow$ © $s$ ］＇even as；${ }^{\sharp}$ not causal＇in－＇ asmuch as＇（Eph．i．4），but as usual， simply modal，referring to the preceding
 ratify the preaching of Epaphras ：as it was in truth that they had known the grace of God，so was it in truth that they had learnt it．On the later form $\kappa \alpha . ⿱ 亠 乂 ⿰ 丿 ⺄ ⿱ ㇒ 日 勺 心, ~$ see notes on Gal．iii．6．The Rec．adds $\kappa$ kal after кaì ${ }^{\prime}$ ：the external authority； however，is weak［D3EKL］，and the probability of a mechanical repetition of the preceding каی̀s kal far from slight； compare Neander，Planting，Vol．1．p： 172 note（Bohn）．
$\left.{ }^{3} E \pi a \phi \rho \hat{a}\right]$ A Colossian（ch．iv．12）who appears from this verse to have been one of the first，if not the first，of the preachers of the gospel in Colossæ：he is again men－ tioned as being in prison with St．Paul at Rome，Philem．23．Grotius and oth－ ers conceive him to have been the Epaph－ roditus mentioned in Philip．ii．25；see Thornd．Right of Ch．ch．III．2，Vol．I． p． 462 （A．－C．Libr．）：this supposition， however，has nothing in its favor except the possible identity of name；see Wi－ ner，$R$ WB．Vol．I．p．330，and notes on ch．ii．25．The reading kas̀ेs kal $\xi^{\prime} \mu d$ dí．will not modify the apparent infer－ ence that Epaphras was the first preacher at Colossæ；this would have been the
 ＇Eл．е̇ $\mu$ úns．$^{2}$ ：see Mcyer in loc．contrasted with Wiggers，Stud．u．Krit．for 1838，p． 185．For the arguments that the apos－ tle himself was the founder of this Church，see Lardner，Credibil．xiv．Vol． 11．p． 472 sq．；for replications and coun－ ter－arguments，Davidson，Introd．Vol． II．p． 402 sq ．$\sigma v \nu \delta o u ́ \lambda o u]$

 Пуєи́ $\mu a t \iota$.

We unceasingly pray that ye may be iruitful in good works, and thankful for your salvation in Christ, -who is the creator, ruler, and reconciler of all things.



'fellow-servant,' i. e. of our common master, Christ: compare ch. iv. 7. This and the further specification in the pronominal clause seem designed to confirm and enhance the authority of Epaphras, тd
 Theoph., compare Theod.
$\dot{v} \pi$ є̀ $\rho \quad \dot{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu]$ ' in your behalf,' i. e. to advance your spiritual good, ' pro vestrâ salute,' Daven., - not ' in your place,' a translation grammatically (Philem. 13, see notes on Gal. ii. 13), but not historically permissible, as this would imply that Epaphr. had been sent to Rome to minister to the apostle (Menoch.), -a supposition which needs confirmation. The reading is slightly doubtful ; Lachm. adopts $\eta \dot{\eta} \mu \bar{\omega} \nu$ with $\Lambda \mathrm{BD}^{1} \mathrm{G} ; 8 \mathrm{mss}$; Boern., in which case ' vice Apostoli ' (Ambrosiast.) would be the natural translation (opp. to Mey.) : the external authority, however, [CD²EFKL; great majority of mss. ; and nearly all Vv .], and the arguments derived from erroneous transcription (compare pref. to Gal. p. xvii, ed. 2) seem decidedly in favor of the reading of Rec., as rightly followed by Tisch. (ed. 2, 7).
8. $\delta \kappa \alpha \vdots \delta \eta \lambda \omega \sigma \alpha s$ ] ' who also made known;' further and accessory statement of the acts of Epaphr. 'H $\mu i v$, as before, refers to the apostle and Timothy; sce notes on ver. 3. $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \dot{\alpha} \pi \eta \nu$ $\epsilon \nu \Pi \nu \in \dot{u} \mu \alpha \tau t]$ 'love in the Spirit; ' not merely love towards the apostle (Theoph., EEcum., and appy. Chrys.), but 'brotherly love' in its most general meaning, in which thåt towards St. Paul was necessarily included; 'erga me et
omnes Christianos,' Corn. a Lap. This love is characterized as in 'the (Holy) Spirit' (compare Rom. xiv. 17, रapà è̀ $\nu$ $\Pi \nu . \dot{a} \gamma \gamma^{\prime}(\omega)$; it was from Him that it arose (compare Rom. xv. 30 , á $\gamma . \tau o \hat{u} \Pi \nu$.), and it was only in the sphere of His blessed influence (surely not $\epsilon^{\epsilon} \nu$ instrumental, 'a Sp. div. excitatum,' Fritz. Rom. Vol. 1II. p. 203) that it was genuine and op-
 $\mu b \nu o v$, Chrys. Cecumenius suggests the the right antithesis (oủ $\sigma a p \kappa \iota \kappa \eta ้ \nu$, $\grave{x} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha}$ $\pi \nu \in \cup \mu a \tau \iota \kappa \mathfrak{\eta} \nu)$; but dilutes the force by the adjectival solution : the omission of the article before $\epsilon \nu \Pi \nu$. is perfectly in accordance with N. Test. usage, and preserves more complete unity of conception ; sce Winer, Gram. § 20. 2, p. 123. On the term à $\alpha$ ár $\eta$, see Reuss, Theul. Chret. Iv. 19, Vol. II. p. 203 sq.
9. $\delta \iota \alpha \dot{\tau} \tau 0 \hat{v} \tau 0]$ 'On this account;' 'because, as we hear, ye have such faith, and have displayed such love:' каی̀ámep



 esp. Eph.i.15. Thus the 'causa impulsiva' (Daven.) of the apostle's prayer is this Christian progress on the part of his converts ; the mode of it is warmly expressed by the intensive oủ tav́ouat к. $\tau . \lambda$. ; the subject (blended with the purpose of it) by ${ }^{2} \nu \alpha \pi \lambda \eta \rho \omega i \hat{\eta} \tau \in \kappa . \tau . \lambda$. $\kappa$ al $\dot{\eta} \mu \in i s]$ 'we also,' 'Timothy and I on our parts ;' gentle contrast between the Colossians and their practical display of vital religion, and the reciprocal prayer of the apostle and his helper.

## 

Kal has here its slightly contrasting force， and is clearly to be joined with $\dot{\eta} \mu \in i \hat{s}$ ， not tov̂to，as De W．；see notes on Phil． iv． 12.
 к．т．入．］＇from the day that we heard；＇ incidental definition of the time，with reference to ảkov́ซavtєs，ver． 4 ，not ${ }^{\alpha} \phi^{\prime}$
 may be echoed in the present clause，but， from the difference of the suljects of the ákovetv，is not directly referred to．
o $\dot{\sim} \pi \sim v^{\prime} \mu \in \mathcal{N} \alpha \kappa$ ．$\tau$ ．$\lambda$ ．］See．the ex－ actly similar affectionate hyperbole in
 où $\delta$ è $\delta u ́ o$ ，oủ tpeís，Chrys．On this idio－ matic use of the part．，which as usual points to a state supposed to be already in existence，see notes and reff．on Eph． i．16，and for a general investigation of the union of the participle with the finite verb，see the good ：treatise of Weller， Bemerk．z．Gr．Synt．p． 11 sq．
$\kappa \alpha\}$ ait ov́ $\mu \in \nu 0$ ］］＇and making our pe－ tition；＇the more special form of the more general $\pi$ pooceux．，see Mark xi．24， Eph．vi．18，and notes in loc．The pres－ ent passage seems to confirm the vierr， expressed Eph．l．c．，and on 1 Tim．ii．1，
 merely for good things（comp．Andrewes， Serm．Vol．v．p．358，A．－C．Libr．），but denotes prayer in its most general as－ pects．On the exact force of $\% \nu \alpha$ ，which has here its secondary telic force，and in which the subject of the prayer is blend－ ed with the purpose of making it，see notes on Eph．i．16．Meyer，as usual， too strongly presses the latter idea．
 knovoledge of His will，＇－of God＇s will， the subject of aủtoû sufficiently transpir－ ing in $\pi \rho \sigma \sigma \in \nu \chi$ ．к．т．$\lambda$ ．The accusative eni ${ }^{2} \nu$ ．is that of the remoter，or，as it is sometimes termed，the＇quantitative＇ object in which the action of the verb has its realization，see Wincr，Gr．§ 32 ．

5，p．205，and notes on Phil．i．11，where this construction is discussed．On the meaning of $\bar{\pi} \pi i \gamma \nu \omega \sigma \iota v$ ，not barcly＇Kennt－ niss＇（compare Rück．on Rom．i．28， Olsh．on Eph．i．17），but＇Erkenntniss，＇ ＇perfecta cognitio，＇Daven．，see notes on Eph．i．17．The remark of Alf．on ver． 6 is apparently just，that the force of the compound can hardly be expressed in English，but the distinction between $\gamma \nu \hat{\omega}-$ $\sigma t s$ and $\begin{gathered}\text { éri } \\ \nu \nu \omega \sigma t s \\ \text {（opp．to Rück，on Rom．}\end{gathered}$ i．28，Olsh．on Eph．i．8）seems no less certain．The former，as De W．rightly suggests，points to a mero unpractical and theoretical，the latter to a full and living，knowledge ；see Wordsworth in loc． テิє入ท́n $\mu a \tau 0 s]$ Obvi－ ously not with any special reference，$\delta$ ò $\tau_{i}^{i} \tau \delta \nu$ শiov є̈ $\pi \epsilon \mu \psi \in \nu$ ，but simply and gen－ crally，His will，－not only in reference to＇credenda，＇but also and perhaps more particularly（Theod．）to＇agenda；＇com－ pare ver．10，and see Davenant in loc． ＇่ $\nu \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \sigma \eta$ к．$\tau . \lambda$ ．］＇in all spiritual wis－ dom and understanding，＇or perhaps more exactly，though less literally，＇in all wis－ dom and understanding of the Spirit，＇ $\pi \nu \in u ́ \mu$ ．referring to the Holy Spirit，＇ （开th．－Pol．），the true source of the бoфía and oúveats，see notes on Ephes．i． 3 ； compare Romans i．11， 1 Cor．ii．13，al． Thus then đ九́á $\eta$（so expressly Syr．，死th．） （Platt），Copt．）and $\pi \nu \in \cup \mu a t \iota k \hat{\eta}$（opp．to Alf．；compare Chrys．）refer to both sub－ stantives，the extensive $\pi \dot{\alpha} \sigma \eta$ referring to every exhibition or manifestation of the бoф．kal $\sigma$ v́v．（see notes on Eph．i．8）， while $\pi \nu \in \nu \mu a \tau \iota k \hat{\eta}$ points to the character－ istics and origin of both．The clause is not purely instrumental，but represents the mode in which，or the concomitant influences under which，the $\pi \lambda \eta \rho \omega \hat{\eta} \hat{\eta} \nu a 1$
 oúv．was not to be à $\nu$ isp $\omega \pi i \nu \eta$（ 1 Cor ．ii． 13）or баркєк斤（2 Cor．i．12），but $\pi \nu \in u$－ $\mu a \tau \iota \kappa \grave{\prime}$, －inspired by and sent from the ：
 Є้р
10. $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \pi a \tau \hat{\eta} \sigma a t]$ So Lachm. with ABCD1FG; 10 mss. ; Clem. (Griesl., Scholz, Mryer, al.). Tisch. (ed. 2, 7) following Rec. adds v́pâs with D"EKL; great majority of mss.; Chrys., Theod., Dam. The addition is deficient in uncial authority, and somewhat opposed to grammatieal usage ; compare Winer, Gircm. § 44. 3, p. 287 sq.
$\tau \hat{\eta}$ ént $\left.\gamma \nu \omega \sigma_{\iota}\right]$ So Lachmann with $\Lambda \mathrm{BCD}^{1} \mathrm{E}^{1} \mathrm{FG}$; nearly 10 mss ; Amit. Tol.; Clem., Syr., Max. (Griesh., Scholz, De IV., Alf.). On the contrary, Tisch. (ed. 2,

 nearly all the $V_{v}$, and Chrys. On reviewing this evidence, the uncial authority is indisputably in favor of the text; the Vr., on the other hand, might seem to be in favor of the insertion of a preposition. As, however, the Vr, may nearly as probabiy have inserted the prep. to explain the ill-tuderstood instrumental dat. $\tau \hat{?}$ € $\pi \iota \gamma \nu$. as the equally misunderstood eis ėmí$\gamma \nu \omega \sigma \nu$, and as internal considerations seciu rather in favor of the simple dat., we return to the reading of Tisch. (ed. 1).

Holy Spirit ; compare Ephes. i. 3, and notes, where however the instrum. force is more distinct. With regard to $\sigma o \phi i \alpha$ and oiveGts, both appear to have a practical refercnce (see esp. Daven.); the former is, however, a general term, the latter (the opposite of which is ávoola, Plato, Rep. III. p. 376 в) its more special result and application; see Harless on Eph. i. 8, and compare Beck, Seelenl. 11. 19, p. 60. Between oúv, and фpóv $\boldsymbol{\eta}^{-}$ $\sigma$ ss (Luke i. 17, Eph. i. 8) the difference is very slight; $\sigma \dot{v} \nu \in \sigma$ ts is perhaps scen more in practically embracing a truth (Ephes. iii. 4), фpóv. more in bringing the mind to bear upon it; compare notes on Eph. i. 8, and Beck, l. c., p. 61.
10. $\pi \in \rho \leq \pi a \tau \hat{\eta} \sigma a b$ к. т. $\lambda$.] 'that ye wall: worthily of the Lord;' purpose and object (iva, Theod., compare Theophyl.), not result (Steiger, al.) of the $\pi \lambda \eta \rho \omega \mathrm{N} \hat{\eta} v a t$, specified by the 'infin. epexegeticus;' see Winer, Gr. §44. 1, p. 284, Bernhardy, Synt. xx. p. 365. For examples of ajglus with the genitive, sce Eph.' iv. 1, Phil. i. 27, 1 Thess. ii. 12, and the examples collected by Raphel, Annot. Vol. II. p. 527. Lastly, Kupiou is not $=\Theta \in o \hat{u}$ (Theod.), but, as appar-
ently always in St. Paul's Epistles, refers to our Lord ; see Winer, Gr. § 19. 1, p. 113. In the Gospels, 2 Pet., and James, it commonly refers to God, but in 1 Pet. ii. 13 (the other examples are quotations) to Christ. $\epsilon$ is $\pi \hat{a} \sigma a \nu$ d. $\rho \in ́ \sigma \kappa$.] 'unto all (every form of) plectsing, ' in omne quod placet,' Claroman., i. e. 'to please Him in all things,' iva
 $\Theta \in \hat{\omega}$ [Kupíç], Theoph. On this use of
 ${ }_{\alpha}^{\circ} \pi$. $\lambda \in \gamma \dot{\prime} \mu$. in the N. T.), sce Locsner, Obs. p. 361, where there will be found several illustrative examples from Phílo, the most pertinent of which are, de Mund. Opif. § 30, Vol. r. p. 35 (ed. Mang.),
 fis àpéoictiav toû marpòs кal Baбt $\lambda$ é $\omega s$, and de Sácrif. §8, Vol. II. p. 257, סı $\pi a \sigma \omega ̂ \nu ~ i ́ e ́ v a \iota ~ \tau \omega ิ \nu ~ \epsilon i s ~ a ̉ p e ́ \sigma r \epsilon t a \nu ~ \delta \delta \omega ิ \nu . ~ O n ~$ the extensive râs, see above, and on Eph. і. 8.
$\epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\pi} \alpha \nu \tau i$
${ }_{\nVdash \rho} \gamma \omega$ à $\gamma$.] 'in every good work ;' sphere in which the картофорía is manifested. This clause is not to be connected with the preceding eis à $\rho \in$ '́ $\kappa \kappa เ a \nu$, as Syriac (Pesh.), Chrys., Theoph., but with the following rapтофор., as Vulg., Gothic,

## 

Syr. (Philox.), Theod., and the majority of modern commentators. The construction is thus perfectly symmetrical, each participle being associated with a modal or instrumental predication. The participles, it need scarcely be said, do not belong to $\pi \lambda \eta \rho$. (Beng.), -a construction which Schwartz quaintly terms a 'carnificinam,' but with the infin., the participle having relapsed into the nom.; see Winer, G'r. § 63. 2, p. 505, and notes on Eph. iii. 18, iv. 2.
 creasing by the (full) lnowledge of God.' The ėniqvarts ©eov was the instrument by which the growth was increased. The reading of Rec., єis т $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \nu \mathrm{\epsilon}$ ढi $\pi i \gamma \nu$., is not cxegectically untenable, as ėniरข. may be viewed with a kind of reciprocal reference as the measure of the moral aúgnots (sec Mey: in loc., and comp. Ephes. iv. 15), but the weight of external evidence, if not also of internal, preponderates amainst it ; sce critical note.
11. є่ $\nu \pi \alpha \sigma \eta$ к. т. $\lambda_{.}$] 'being strengthened with all (every form of) strength;' third participial clause parallel to, and in co-ordination with, ėv $\pi a \nu \tau l$ к. $\tau . \lambda$. 'E $\nu$ here scems purely instrumental (contrast ver. 9), the action being considered as involved in the means ; see Jelf, Gr . § 623. 3 : with this may be compared the simple dat. Eph. iii. 16, see notes in loc. Alford regards $̇ v$ as denoting the clement, $\delta \dot{v} \nu \alpha \mu u s$ being subjective: this is possible ; the instrumental force, however, seems clearly recognized by Theod.,
 more simple and natural. The simple form $\delta v \nu a \mu \delta \omega$ is an ${ }_{\alpha}^{\alpha} \pi$. $\lambda \epsilon \gamma \gamma^{\prime} \mu$. in the N. T. (sce Psalm lxvii. 28, Eccles. x. 10, Dan. ix. 27), Є̇vōvva $\mu \dot{\omega} \omega$ being the more usual form.
$\kappa u \tau \grave{\alpha}$ $\tau$.ठ крátos $\tau \hat{\eta} s \delta$.] 'according to the power of His glory;' not His glorious power,' Auth., Beza, al., but 'the power
which is the peculiar characteristic of Iis glory,' the gen. belonging to the category of the gen. possessivus ; compare notes on Eph. i. 6. The prep. кarà represents, not the source (Daven.), nor the motive (Stcig.), but, as usual, the norma, in accordance with which, and in correspondence with which, the $\delta u \nu \alpha{ }^{\prime} \mu \omega \sigma \iota s$ would be effected. The power which is the attribute of the glory of Gorl indicates the measure and degree in which the Colossians will be strengthened; ou $\chi$

 Chrysost. On the deriv. of крáros, see notes on Eph. i. 19.
є's $\pi \hat{a} \sigma \alpha \nu \quad \kappa . \tau . \lambda$.$] 'unto all patience$ and longsuffering;' i. e. 'to insure, to luad you into, every form of patience and longsuffering;' ' ut procrect in nobis [vobis] patientiam,' etc., Davenant, - the prep., as usual, marking the final destination of the $\delta v \nu \alpha{ }^{\prime} \mu \omega \sigma$ Ls. The distinction between theso words is not very clear :

 that quoted, but not adopted by I)aven. ( $\dot{\pi} \boldsymbol{\rho}$. ad illa mala quæ a Deo infliguntur $\mu$ aкроэ. ad illa quæ ab hominibus. inferuntur) is quite satisfactory, as both, on different sides, seem too restrictive. Perhaps $\dot{\text { unouov̀ }}$ is moro general, designating that ' brave patience,'-not ' endurance,' with which the Christian ought to bear all trials, whether from God or men, from within or without (sce notes on 2 Tim. ii. 10, and on Tit. ii. 2), while $\mu a k$ pois. points more to forbearance, whether towards the sinner (see on Eph. iv. 2), the gainsayer, or even the persecutor: sec on 2 Tim. iii. 10. $\mu \in \tau \grave{\alpha}$ $\chi \propto \rho \bar{a} s$ is joined by Theodoret, Olsh., De W., Alf., and others, with the preceding clause ; so appy. Vulg., Coptic, Goth., Syriac (Philox.), and EEthiop. Viewed alone, this connection seems


very plausible, - the $\dot{i \pi o \mu}$. and $\mu \alpha \kappa \rho$. are to be associated with joy, the resignation is to be genuinely Christian, compare Daven. As, however, each preceding clause commences with a defining prepositional adjunct, and both vimouov̀̀ and $\mu$ aicfos. are perfectly distinct and are commonly used, whether in juxtaposition (2 Cor. vi. 4, 6, 2 Tim. iii. 10) or scparately (Rom. v. 3, 2 Cor. xii. 12, al. ; Gal. v. 22, Col. iii. 12, al.), without any further definition, it seems more natural, with Syr., Chrys., Theoph., Ecumen., and recently Mey., Lachm., and Tisch., to connect the defining words with $\epsilon \dot{u} \chi \alpha$ ptotô̂vTes.
 to the Father,' scil. ' of our Lord Jesus Christ;' participial clause, obviously not dependent on ou $\pi a v \delta \mu$. verse 9 (Chrys., Theoph.), but co-ordinate with the preceding clauses. The meaning of єù $\chi$ ap. is well discussed by Boeckh, Corp. Inscr. Vol. 1. p. 521 ; it is there stated to have four meanings : (a) Attic, 'gratificari,' $\chi$ ápıv $\delta \iota \delta o ́ v a l ; ~(b) ~ n o n-A t t i c, ~ ' g r a-~$ tias habere uel referre; but see Demosth. de Cor. p. 257. 2 ; (c) gratias agere verbis,' used by Polyb. (xvı. 25. 1, xviri. 26. 4, xxx. 11.1) and later writers ; (d) 'yratias referre simul et agere gratificando,' found in certain inscript. : see also notes on Phil. i. 12. The readings $\tau \hat{\varphi} \pi$. kal $\Theta \epsilon \hat{\varphi}$ and $\tau \hat{\varphi} \Theta \epsilon \hat{\varphi} \kappa \cdot \pi$. are obvious interpolations, and rest on no critical authority ; see Tisch. in loc.
$\tau \hat{\varphi} . i \kappa \alpha \nu \omega$ -
$\sigma \alpha \nu \tau \iota$ к. $\tau . \lambda_{\text {.] }}$ ' who made us meet for the portion of the inheritance of the saints in light.' These words deserve some consideration. In the first place the reading is slightly doubtful: D1FG; 17. 80; Claroman., Goth. ; Did. ; Lat. Ff. read $\kappa а \lambda \epsilon ́ \sigma \alpha \nu т \iota$ for iккаע., while Lachm., with B, retains both т $\hat{\varphi}$ ikav. каl ка入. The critical preponderance is, however, clear-
ly in favor of ikav., for which кa入é $\sigma$. would have formed a natural gloss. (2) 'Icav. is not 'qui dignos fecit, 'Vulg., but ค compare Eth. ; sce 2 Cor. iii. 6, ôs каl ir $\alpha \nu \nu \omega \sigma \in \nu$ ín $\alpha \hat{s}$, where the meaning is perfectly clear. Again the part. has not here a causal force 'quippe qui,' Meyer (compare Theod., ötı коเขшעoùs àmé $\varphi \eta \nu \epsilon$ ), - a meaning which is precluted by the presence of the article (see notes on Eph. i. 12), but is distinctly predicative, and somewhat solemnly descriptive ; $\pi 0 \lambda \grave{\nu} \tau \delta$ Bápos ě $\delta \in!\xi \in \nu$, Chrys. The principal difficulty is, however, in the construction, as $\epsilon \nu \tau \hat{\psi} \phi \omega \tau i$ may admit of at least four connections, (a) with ik $\alpha \nu \omega \dot{\sigma} \alpha \nu \tau \iota$, in an instrumental (Meyer) or semi-modal sense, - as apparently Chrys., Cecum., Theoph., who explain $\phi \omega \tau$ l as $=\gamma \nu \omega \sigma \sigma l$; (b) with $\tau \grave{\nu} \nu \mu \in \rho i \delta a$ (Beng.), $̇ \nu \nu$ having a local force, and defining the position of the $\mu \epsilon \rho$ is ; (c) with $\dot{\alpha} \gamma i \omega \nu,-\epsilon^{2} \nu \phi \omega \tau l$ designating their abode ; compare Grotius ; lastly and most probably, $(d)$ with клйpou, or more exactly $\kappa \lambda \eta$ pov $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ á $\gamma i \omega \nu$, the gen. specifying the possessors, and so indirectly the character of the $\kappa \lambda \hat{\eta} p o s$, the prep. clause its 'situm et conditionem,' Corn. a Lap. Of these (a), though ably defended by Meyer, is harsh and improbable ; (b) causes a dislocation in the order, unless $\mu \epsilon \rho . \kappa . \tau . \lambda$. be all taken as one idea (Alford), in which case the omission of the article is not perfectly satisfactory ; (c) gives to of alyıo an undue prominence, compare Alford; (d) on the contrary seems to give to the $\kappa \lambda \hat{\eta} \rho o s$ $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\alpha} \gamma$. exactly the qualifying; or possibly localizing definition it requires, and preserves a good antithesis with $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \xi$. $\tau 0 \hat{v}$ okórous, , , 13, which (a) especially obscures ; compare Acts xxvi. 18. The art. before $\ell \nu \tau \hat{\varphi} \phi \omega \tau l$ is not needed, as


$\kappa \lambda \nmid \rho$. $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\alpha} \gamma, \epsilon \in \tau \hat{\omega} \phi$. forms a single idea (Winer; Gram. §20. 2, p. 123) : with the whole clause (Alf.) it could be less easily tiispensed with. We retain then $(d)$ with De W., perhaps Theod., and apparently the majority of interpreters. There remain only a few details.
$\kappa \lambda \hat{\eta} \rho o s]$ ' inheritance,' Acts xxvi. 18; properly 'a lot' (Matth. xxvii. 35, Mark xv. 24), thence anything obtained by lot (compare Acts i. 25, Rec.), and thence, with a greater latitude, anything assigned or apportioned ( (ó́mos, $\kappa \tau \hat{\eta} \mu \alpha$, oủ$\sigma_{i}^{\prime} \alpha$ i) $\lambda a \chi \mu o ́ s$, Suid.), whether officially ( 1 Pet. v. 3 ; ' cleros appellat particulares ecclesias, Calv.), or, as here, a possession and inheritance; comp. Heb. The $\left.\kappa \lambda \hat{\lambda} \hat{p} \rho o s{ }^{\epsilon} \nu\right\rangle$. is represented as a joint inheritance of the saints, of which each individual has his $\mu \in \rho i \delta \alpha$. The derivation is uncertain; perhaps from $\kappa \lambda \alpha \in \epsilon \nu$, i. e. a 'broken-off' portion (Pott, Etym. Forsch. Vol. 11. p. 597), or, less probably, from Sanscr. krī, with sense of 'casting,' or 'parting off' (Benfey, Wurzellex. Vol. iI. p. 172). Its more specific use in ecel. writers is well illustrated by Suicer, Thesaur. s. v. Vol. II. p. 110 sq.
$\hat{\epsilon} \geqslant \tau \hat{\varphi} \phi \omega \tau\}$ It is not necessary to refer this specifically to the heavenly realm: $\phi \hat{\text { os }}$ marks its characteristics on the side, not merely of its glory (Huth., compare Bp. Hall, Invis. World, II. 5) but, as the antithesis suggests, of its essential purity and perfections ; compare 1 John i. 5 This blessed inheritance may be entered upon in part even here on earth. For a good sermon on this text, see Beveridge, Serm. II. Vol. vi. p. 399.
13. ठ̀s $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \rho \dot{\rho} \rho \dot{\prime} \sigma \alpha \tau 0$ к. т. $\lambda$.] Appositional relative-sentence (Winer, Grom. §60.7, p. 479), introducing a contrasted amplification of the preceding clause, and preparing for a transition to the doctrine of the person, the glory, and
the redeeming love of Christ, ver. 1420. The special meanings that have been assigned to èpepṕvato (' cripuit ; plus hoe est quam liberavit: . . . . eripiuntur sxpe inviti,' Zanch.), though in part philologically defensible (see Buttm. Lexil. s. v. §53.1,2), cannot be certainly maintained in the $N . T$, where for the most part the idea of 'dragging from a crowd of enemies' (comp. Luke i. 74, 2 Tim. iii. 11, iv. 17 ; - surely not unwilling) passes into the more generic idea of 'saving;' see Buttm. l.c., § 3. The remark of Theoph. is much more in point ; oủk


 darkness ;' the power which is possessed and exerted by Darkness, - not, however, merely subjectively, тîs $\pi \lambda a ́ v \eta s$, Chrys. 1, but evil and sin, viewed objectively as the antithesis of $\phi \hat{\omega} s, i$. e. $\tau 0 \hat{v} \delta \iota-$ aßólou т $\bar{s}$ тupavyíoos, Chrys. 2, Theod. $\mu \in \tau \in \sigma \tau \eta \sigma \in \nu]$ ' translated,' 'removed:' redemption in its further and positive aspects. The verb clearly involves a local reference, the removing from one place and fixing in another; we were taken out of the realms of darkness and transferred to the kingdom of light : see Joseph. Antiq. IX. 11. 1, тoùs. oikńropas $\mu \in T \in ́ \sigma \tau \eta \sigma \in \nu$ єis $\tau \eta ̀ \nu$ aù $\frac{1}{} \hat{v} \beta \alpha \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon i \alpha \nu$. The further idea ' migrare cogit ex natali solo,' Daven., though theologically true, is not necessarily involved in the word.
$\epsilon$ is $\tau \dot{\eta} \nu \beta \alpha \sigma \iota \lambda \in\{\alpha, \nu]$ The term $\beta a \sigma l^{-}$ $\lambda$ tía has here a reference neither purcly metaphorical (e.g. the Church; comp. Huth.), nor ethical and inward (Olsh.; Luke xvii. 21), nor jetideal and proleptic (Mey.), - but, as the image involved in $\mu \in \tau \in ́ \sigma \tau$. suggests, semilocal and descriptive. Nor is this wholly future; the vioi roû $\phi \omega \tau$ ós, the pure and the holy (comp. Matth. v. 8, Heb. xii. 14), even


while tarrying in these lower courts are the subjects of that kingdom, the 'denizens' of that $\pi 0 \lambda i \tau \in v \mu \alpha$ (Phil, iii. 20), the sharers of that vioiteoia (Eph. i. 5), just as the viol $\tau \hat{\eta} s \dot{\alpha} \pi \in \epsilon \hat{\text { ctias }}$ are even here on earth the occupants of the realm of darkness and the vassals of its коб $\mu$ кра́тореs. A long and elaborate treatise on the $\beta a \sigma_{t} \lambda \in i ́ a$ © $\Theta o \hat{u}$ will be found in Comment. Theol. Vol. 11. p. 107-173.
$\tau \bar{\eta} s \dot{\alpha} \gamma \alpha \pi \eta s$ aviтồ] 'of Ilis love,' $i . e$ who is the olject of it, whom it embraces. This genitive has received different explanations; it has been regarded as (u) a genitive of the characterizing quality (compare Winer, Gr. § 34. 3. b, p. 211), in which it differs little from à $\gamma a \pi \eta \tau$ ós, Mathew iii. 17, Mark xii. 6, al., or $\grave{\eta} \gamma a \pi \eta \mu \epsilon \in ́ v o s$, Eiphes. i. 6, compare Chrys.; (b) a species of gen. originis, à $\gamma$ ám $\eta$ being considered more as an essence than an attribute; sce August. de Trin. x. 19 (cited by Est. and Just.), and Olsh. in loc. ; $(c)$ the gen. of the remoter object (comp. Winer, Gr. § 30. 2, p. 169), 'the son who has His love,' Steiger, compare Wordsw. ; or, simply and more probably, $(d)$ the gen. subjecti, àán $\eta$ s being classed under the general head of the possessive genitive ; comp. Krüger, Sprachl. § 47. 7. 7 : De Wette and Mey. compare Gen. xxxv. 18, viòs òóvns uov. It has been thought that the title is specially selected to imply some reference to the vionteria (Huth.); this is possible, but the context and a comparison with Ephes. i. 6, 7, do not favor the supposition.
14. 'ॄ $\nu \quad \AA]$ 'in whom ;' certainly not 'by whom,' but 'in' Him as the living source of redemption : sce notes on Eph. i. 7, where these and the following words in the clause are commented upon' and illustrated.

Є $\chi$ о $\mu \in \nu$ т $\grave{\eta} \nu$
$\grave{\varrho} \pi 0 \lambda$.] 'we are having the redemption,'
not 'our redemption,' Alford, but 'the red.,' or with idiomatic omission of the art:, 'Redemption,' Auth., - the reference being to the redemption from the wrath and punitive justice of God in its most comprehensive signification, whether specially ours or common to us and to all mankind. The prep. $\dot{\alpha} \pi \grave{\partial}$ is not intensive (oùk єīmє $\lambda \dot{\sim} \tau \rho \omega \sigma \tau \nu$, à $\lambda \lambda^{\prime}$ à $\pi o \lambda$., $\ddot{\omega} \sigma \tau \epsilon \mu \eta \delta ̀ ̀ े \pi \epsilon \sigma \epsilon i ̂ \nu \lambda o l \pi \delta \nu$, Chrys.), but, with its ustal force ('separationis remotionisque potestas,' Winer, Verb. Comp. IV. 5), points to the punishment and divine wrath from which we were redeemed in Christ and by His blood. On the four degrees of redemption, - viz., (a) payment of ransom for all, (b) admission into the Church, (c) exemption from tyranny of sin here, and $(d)$ exemption from hell and death hereafter, - see Jackson, C'reed, Ix. 5, Vol. viir. p. 218 sq. (Oxf. 1844). For other details sec notes on Eph. i. 7. There is some variation in reading ; $\delta$ tà toû aïu. (Rec.) rests only on cursive mss., and is rightly omitted by nearly all modern editors. ${ }^{\text {e }}$ E $\chi \not \mu \in \nu$ is more doubtful, as it might be a change in conformity with Eph. i. 7. Lachm. reads é $\sigma \chi \circ \mu \in \nu$ with B (A is doubtful), Copt. [an-si] ; but the diplomatic authority scems insufficient to warrant the change. $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ $\left.\dot{\alpha} \phi \in \sigma^{\prime} \iota \nu \tau \bar{\omega} \nu \quad \dot{\alpha} \mu a \rho \tau.\right]$ 'the forgiveness of our sins ;' apposition to the preceding $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \dot{\nu} \pi)_{0}$ i, defining more exactly its nature and significance. On the distinction between $\alpha \not \phi \epsilon \sigma \iota s$ and $\pi \alpha \rho \in \sigma \iota s$, sce Trench, Synon, § 33, and on that between ¿́ $\mu \alpha \rho \tau i \alpha l$ and $\pi \alpha \rho a \pi \tau \omega \mu \mu \tau \alpha$, notes on $E p h$. i. 7 .
 scription of the peison of Christ, His dignity, and His exaltation, for which the preceding verse and the allusion to $\beta a \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon i a$ in ver. 13 form a suitable prep-

aration．As this forms one of the three important passages in St．Paul＇s Epistles （Ephesians i．20－23，Phil．ii．6－11）in which the doctrine of the person of Clirist is especially unfolded，both the general divisions and the separate details will require very eareful consideration．With regard to the former，it seems scarcely doubtful that there is a twofold division， and that，as in Phil．ii．7，каi $\sigma \chi \eta$ п̆нать к．т．$\lambda$ ．seemed to introduce a new por－ tion of the subject，so here the second ral aủtds（v．18）indicates a similar transi－ tion；and further，that，just as in Phil． l．c．the first portion related to the $\Lambda$ ofos äбаркоs，the latter to the $\Lambda$ óros ěv $\downarrow$ аркоs， so here in ver． $15-17$ ，the reference is rather to the pre－incarnate Son in His re－ lation to God and to His own creatures， in ver．18－20 to the incarnate and now glorified Son in His relations to His Church：so Olsh．，hastily condemned by Meyer，but，in effect and inferentially， supported by the principal Greek and majority of Latin Fathers ：comp．Pear－ son，Creed，Vol．1．p．14．Sce contra， Hofmann，Schriftb．Vol．I．p．135，whose opposition，however，is based on the more than doubtful supposition that кal aùtos（ver．17）is dependent on the fore－ groing ött．＂Os thus refers to the subject $\delta$ viobs $\tau \hat{\eta} s$ ả $\gamma$ ．aủtoû in its widest and most complex relations，whether as Cre－ ator or Redeemer，the immediate context defining the precise nature of the refer－ ence ：－see on Phil．ii． 6.
$\epsilon i \kappa \omega े \nu \tau o \hat{v}$ © $\in o \hat{v} \tau . \tau . \lambda$ ．］＇the image of the invisible God；＇not＇an image，＇ Wakef．，or＇image，＇Alf．，－the article is idiomatically omitted after é $\sigma \tau \iota \nu$ ；sce Middl．Gr．Art．nir．3．2．With this ex－ pression comp． 2 Cor．iv． 4 ，ös $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \iota \nu$ єikc̀े $\tau o \hat{v}$ Өєô̂，Heb．i．3，à $\pi \alpha u ́ \gamma \alpha \sigma \mu \alpha \tau \hat{\eta} s ~ \delta \delta ́ \xi \eta \eta s$
 Christ is the original image of God， ＇bearing his figure and resemblauce as
truly，fully，and perfectly as a son of man has all the features，lineaments，and perfections belonging to the nature of man，＇Waterl．Serm．Chr．Div．v．Vol． Ir．p．104，see especially Athan．Nicen． Def．§ 20.

Without overpassing the limits of this commentary，we may observe that Christian antiquity has ever regarded the expression＇image of God＇ as denoting the eternal Son＇s perfect equality with the Father in respect of His substance，nature，and eternity ； ＇perfectr æqualitatis significantiam ha－ bet similitudo，＇Hil．de Syn．§ 73 ，à $\pi a-$ páллактоs єíkஸ̀v тô̂ Пatpòs［on the sub－ sequent Semi－arian use of this term，seo Oxf．Libr．of Ff．Vol．viri．p．35，106］ каl тои̂ тратоти́тоン ёィгvтоs характท̆p， Alex．ap．Theod．Hist．Eccl．1． 4 ；see Athan．contr．Arian．y．20．＇The Son is the Father＇s image in all things save only in being the Father，єiкcढेע фибぃкो＞ каl à à $\pi \alpha \alpha^{\prime} \lambda \lambda a \kappa \tau o s ~ к а т \alpha ̀ ~ \pi \alpha ́ \nu \tau \alpha ~ \delta \mu o i ́ a ~ \tau \hat{̣}$
 т $\eta$ tos，Damase．de Imag．III． 18 ；comp． Athan．contr．Arian．I． 21.
The exact force of the emphatically placed rov̀ àopátou（＇who is invisible，＇ Wordsw．；Winer，Gram．§20．1．a，p． 120）is somewhat doubtful．Does it point to the primal invisibility（Chrys．， Orig．ap．Athan．Nic．D（f．§ 27），or，by a tacit antithesis，to the visidility，of the єircóv（Daven．，Meyer，al．；comparo 2 Cor．iii．18，Hcb．xii．14）？Apparently to the latter：Christ，as God and as the original image of God，was of course primarily and essentially ảópatos（è $\pi \in l$ où ơ＇àv єikc̀v eïn，Chrys．）；as，however， the Son that declared the Father（John i．18），as He that was pleased to reveal Himself visibly to the saints in the O．T． （see especially，Bull，Def．Fid．Nic．I．I． 1 sq ．）．He was óparós，the manifester of Ihin who dwells in фŵs àmpóotion（1 Tim．vi．16）and whom no man hath

## 

seen or can see; John j. 18 ; compare Beng. in loc. Whether there is here any approximation to views entertained by Philo (Olsh., Alf., sce Usteri, Leherb. Ir. 2. 4, p. 293), is very doubtful. We must at any rate remember that Philo was the uninspired exponent of the better theosophy of his day; St. Paul the inspired dpostle revealing the highest and most transcendent mysteries of the Divine economy. - On the meaning of єik $\omega$, and its distinction from $\delta \mu 0 i \omega \sigma \iota s$, see Trench, Synon. § 15.
$\pi \rho \omega \tau$ ótokos $\pi \alpha \sigma \eta s \quad k \tau\{\sigma$.$] 'the$ first-born before every creature,' i. e. 'begotten, and that antecedently to cverything that was created ;' surely not 'the whole creation,' Waterland (Vol. II. p. 57), compare Alf., - an incxact translation which here certainly (contrast on Eph. ii. 21) there scems no necessity for maintaining; compare Middleton, Gr. Art. p. 373. As verse 17 ( $\pi \rho \delta{ }^{\alpha} \pi \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \omega \nu$ ) expressly reiterates, our Lord is here solemnly defined as трбтóтокоs in relation to every created thing, animate or inanimate, human or superhuman ; $\pi \rho \omega$ -
 $\mu \alpha ́ \tau \omega \nu$, Just. Martyr, Dial. § 100. This notable expression has received every variety of explanation. Grammat. considered, $\tau \hat{\eta} s \kappa \tau i \sigma \epsilon \omega s$ may perhaps be the part. gen., the posses. gen. (Hof. Schurfitb. Vol. 1. 137), or, much more probably, the gen. of the point of view, 'in reference to, 'in comparison to,' (Scheuerl. Synt. § 18. 1. p. 129), the latent comparative force involved in the $\pi \rho \omega$ owos rendering this last genitival relation still more intelligible and perspicuous ; comp. Fritz. on Rom. x. 19, Vol. II. p. 421. In the first two cases, $\pi$ â $\sigma a \kappa$ кiбıs must be considered as equiv, to a plur. (
 i. e. every form of creation (comp. Hof-
mann, l.c.), the expression compared with $\pi \rho \omega \tau$ и́токоs $\tau \bar{\omega} \nu$ עєкр $\bar{\omega} \nu$, Rev. i. 5 , and (esp. in the last of these cases) the Arian deduction, that Christ is a kriots, deened grammatically possible; see Usteri, Lehrb. Ir. 2. 4, and even Reuss, Theul. Chret. iv. 10, Vol. 11. p. 100 , both which writers use language, which, without the limitation named by Thorndike (Cov. Grace, Ir. 17. 5), must be pronounced simply and plainly Arian. In the last casc, $\pi \hat{\alpha} \sigma \alpha$ ктíots retains its proper force, $\pi \rho \omega \tau \delta \tau о к о$ its comparative reference, and the conclusion of Athanase, especially when viewed in connection with the context (ötı Є̀v aủrê ékr., ver. 16), perfectly incritable ; ä $\lambda \lambda$ os $̇$ é $\sigma \tau \iota$
 $\kappa \tau \iota \sigma \tau \eta\rangle s \delta_{\epsilon} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \kappa \tau เ \sigma \mu \alpha ́ \tau \omega \nu$, conlr. Arian. 1r. $\$ 62$, - a passare of narvellous force and perspicuity : seo also, both on this and ver. 16, Pearson, Creed, Vol. I. p. 148. The term $\pi$ ратótokos (obs. not
 ously used to define our Lord's relation to His creatures and His brotherhood with them (comp. Rom. viii. 29), and is in this respect distinguished from $\mu$ ovo$\gamma \in \nu$ خ̀s which more exactly defines His relation to the Father ; $\mu 0 \nu 0 \gamma \in \nu \grave{\eta} s \mu^{\prime} \nu$,

 [condescension] кal $\tau \eta{ }^{2} \nu \tau \omega ิ \nu \pi \sigma \lambda \lambda \omega \hat{\nu} \alpha \dot{\alpha} \delta \epsilon \lambda$ фотоínotv, Athan. contr. Arian. II. 62 : in a word, He was begotten, they were created, - the gulf infinite, yct as He stooped to wear their outward form, so He disdains not to institute, by the mouth of His apostle, temporal comparison between His own generation from cternity and their creation in time; sce Bull, Defen. Fid. Nic. nii. 9. 9, who however appears to have misunderstood the meaning of ovyкaтáßaбıs, compare Newman, in ()xf. Libr. of Ff. Vol. viri. p. 288.
Lastly, as there seem to be two senses in

## 

Scripture in which our Lord is first-born in respect of every creature, viz., in its restoration after the fall as well as in its first origin (seo Athan. l.c., § 63), we may possibly admit, as ver. 18 also partially suggests, a secondary and inferential, - certainly not a primary (Theod.Mops. ; Ethı, 'supra omnia opera'), nor even co-ordinate, reference to priority in dignity ( $\pi \rho 0 \tau\{\mu \eta \sigma t s$ ) : see Alf. in loc., who, however, unduly presses this reference, and by referring the whole to Christ in his now glorified state (so Mey:, and Hofmann, Schrifib. Vol. i. p. 135), certainly seems to impair the theological force and significance of this august passage. For further doctrinal comments see the good note of Wordsworth in loc.
16. ©́ T t ] 'because,' not 'for,' Alf., a translation better reserved for $\gamma$ áp, logical elucidation of the preceding member: He , in the sphere of whose creative power all things were made and on whom all things depend, was truly the трото́т. та́бŋs ктíбєшs, and had an eternal priority in time and dignity. The objections of Schleiermacher (Stud. u. Krit. 1832, p. 502) to the logic of this causal explanation are unreasonable and pointless. $\quad \in \nu$ a v̇ $\tau \hat{\omega}]{ }^{\text {' in }}$ Him,' as the creative centre of all things, the causal element of their existence; compare Winer; Gr. §50. 6, p. 372 (ed. 6 ; here judiciously altered). The preposition has received several different explanations, three of which deserve consideration : $\epsilon \nu \downarrow$ has been referred to Christ as $(a)$ the causa instrumentalis ( $\epsilon^{\prime} \nu=\delta \iota^{\prime}$ ), creation being conceived as existing in the means, Jelf, Gr. § 622. 3 ; (b) the causa exemplaris, the кóб $\mu$ оs voךrds being supposed to be included and to have its essentiality (Olsh.) in Him as the great exemplar; (c) the causa conditionalis, the act of creation being supposed to rest in

Him, and to depend on Him for its completion and realization. Of there $(a)$ is adopted by the Greek commentators, but is open to the serious objection that no distinction is preserved between $\dot{\nu} \nu \operatorname{auj} \tau \hat{\varphi}$ hero and $\delta i^{i}$ aủroû below, which St. Paul's known use of prepositions (sce notes on Gal. i. 1) would lead us certainly to expect. The second (b) is adopted by the schoolmen and recently by Olsh., Neander, Bisp., but is highly artificial, and supported by no analogry of Scripture. We therefore adopt (c) which is theologically exact and significant, and in which St. Paul's peculiar, yet somewhat varied, use of $\dot{\epsilon} \nu$ Xptotệ wit'ı verbs (compare 2 Cor. v. 19, Gal. ii. 17, Eph. i. 4, al.) is suitably maintained : compare the similar usage of $\epsilon \nu$, especially with pronouns, to denote the subject in which and on which ('den Haltpunkt') the action
 Soph. Ajax, 519; sce Rost u. Palm, Lex. s. v. $̇$ ev, 2. b, Vol. I. p. 509 , Bernhardy, Synt. v. 8. b, p. 210.
éc $\tau[\sigma \vartheta \eta]$ 'were created,' with simple plysical ref. : observe the worist of the past action, as contrasted with éктьбта! below, in which the duration and persistence of the act ('per effectus suos clurat,' see on Eph. ii. 8) is brought into especial prominence ; comp. 1 Cor. xr. 27, and Winer, Gr. § 40. 4, p. 243. The forced (ethical) meaning 'were arranged, reconstituted' (Schleierm.), thongh lexically admissible, is fully disproved by Meyer, who observes that $\kappa$ rí $\ddagger \omega$ always in the N. T. (even in Eph. ii. 10, 15, iv. 25) implies the bringing into existence, spiritually or otherwise, of what before was not. For an exposition of this important text sec Conc. Antioch. ap. Routh, Relig. Sacr. Vol. II. p. 468, referred to by Wordsw. in loc. $\quad \tau \grave{\alpha} \pi \alpha \nu \tau \alpha]$ 'all things (that exist)' - more specifically defined, first in regard of place, spe-
ondly in regard of nature and essential characteristics. On the use of the art. ('das All'), see W., Gr. § 18.8, p. 105. $\tau \dot{\alpha}$ ėv $\tau$ ois oủp. к. т. $\lambda$.] 'the things in the heaven, and the things on the earth;' not in reference merely to intelligent beings (Huther), nor to the exclusion of things under the earth (Phil. ii. 10), but, as in Eph. i. 10 (see notes), with the fullest amplitude, - 'all things and beings whatsoever and wheresoever; 'hâc distributione universam ereaturam complectitur,' Daven. The following clauses carry out the universality of the reference, by specifying the two classes of things, the visible and material, and the juvisible and spiritual, -which latter class is still further specified by disjunctive enumerations.
 visible and the things invisible;' amplification - not exclusively of the former
 $\epsilon^{\prime \prime} \tau \in$ óparò [as sun, moon, and stars] ë̈ $\tau \in$ ábpata, Theod.), or exclusively of the latter member (à $\alpha \rho a \tau a \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \psi v \chi \grave{\eta} \nu \lambda \in ́ \gamma \omega \nu$,
 both, 'the risible and invisible world:' 'in coclo visibilia sunt sol, luna, stellæ; invisibilia, angeli : in terrâ visibilia, plantr, elementa, animalia; invisibilia, animæ, humanæ,' Daven., - unless indeed, as the following enumeration seems to imply, this last class, 'animæ liumanæ,' be grouped with $\delta \rho a \tau \alpha$ (Mey.).
 whether dominions, whether principalities, 'whether powers;' disjunctive specification of the preceding adopara; 'lest in that invisible world, among the many degrees of the celestial hierarchy, any order might seem exempted from an essential dependence upon Him, he nameth those which are of greatest eminence, and in them comprehendeth the rest,' Pearson, Creed, Vol. I. p. 148. There seems no
reason to modify the opinion advanced on Eph. i. 21, that four orders of heavenly intelligence are here enumerated; see notes and references in loc., Reuss, Theol. Chret. Iv. 20, Vol. II. p. 226 sq., and the extremely good article in Suicer, Thesaur. s. v. ä $\gamma$. Vol. 1. p. 30-48. By comparing this passage with Eph. l.c., where the order seems descensive, we may possibly infer that the Npóvot (not clsewhere in N. T., but noticed in Dyonys. Areop. de Hier., and in Test. xır. Patr. p. 532, Fabric.) are the highest order of blessed spirits, those sitting round the cternal throne of God, кuptóv $\eta \tau \in s$ the
 ate (Mey.), if indeed, as is olserved on Eph.l.c., all such distinctions are not to be deemed precarious and presumptuous; compare Bull, Scrm. xir. p. 221, and Hofmann, Sclriftb. Vol. 1. p. 302. This enumeration may have been suggested by some known thcosophistic speculations of the Colossians (chap. ii. 18, compare Maurice, Unity of N.T.p. 566), but more probably, as in Epl. i. 21, was an incidental revelation, which the term $\dot{\alpha} \delta \rho a \tau \alpha$ evoked. Of the other numerous interpretations which these words have received (see De Wette in loc.), none seem worthy of serious attention. $\tau \grave{\alpha} \pi \alpha ́ \nu \tau \alpha \kappa$. $\tau$. $\lambda$.] ‘(yea) all thinys,' etc.; solemn recapitulation of the foregoing. The most natural punctuation scems to be neither a period (Tisch.), nor a comma (Alf.), least of all a parenthesis (Lachm.), but, as in Mill, and in Buttmann's recent edition, a colon.
$\delta \imath^{2} \alpha \dot{u} \tau o \hat{v}$ kal $\epsilon$ is aúv $\delta \nu$ ] 'through Hin and for Him;' resumption of ėv aù $\frac{\hat{\varphi}}{}$ êkr. with a change both in tense and prepositions; there the Son was represented as the 'causa conditionalis' of all things, here as the 'causa medians' of creation, and the 'causa finalis' (Daven.) or 'finis ulti-
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mus' (Calov.) to which it is referred. It was to form a portion of His glory, and to be subjected to His dominion (comp. Matth. xxviii. 18) that all things were created; єis av̀z $\partial \nu$ крє́ $\mu a \tau \kappa l ~ \grave{\eta} \pi \alpha ́ \nu-$

 Chrys. We may observe that the mediate creation, and final destination, of the world, here referred to the Son, are in Rom. xi. 36 referred to the Father. Such permutations deserve our serious consideration; if the Son had not been God, such an interchange of important relations would never have seemed possible: compare Waterland Def. Qu. xx. Vol. I. p. 383 sq., Vol. 11. p. 54, 56. On the force of the perf. éktเซтal, see above; and in answer to the attempts to refer this passage to any figurative creation, seo Pearson, Creed, Vol. x. p. 149, 150 (ed. Burt.).
17. кal aủ $\delta$ s к. т. 入.] 'and He Himself, etc. ; contrast between the creator and the things created; aùvos being emphatic, and kal having a gentle contrasting force (sce notes on Phil. iv. 12) by which the tacit antithesis involved in aủcos ('ipse oppositum habet alium,' Hermann, Dissert., aùtós 1) between the things created ( $\tau \dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \alpha$ ) and Him who created thom is still more enhanced : they were created in time, He their creator is and was before all timc. It may be observed that though autds appears both in this and the great majority of passages in the $N$. T. to liave its proper classical force ('ut rem ab aliis rebus discernendam esse indicet,' Herm. Dissert. l.c.), the Aramaic use of the corresponding pronoun should make us cautious in pressing it in every case. The vernacular tongue of the writers of the N. T. must have produced some effect on their diction.
$\pi \rho \delta$ $\pi d \nu \tau \omega \nu]$ 'before all things,' not 'all
beings' (' omnes,' Vulg., Clarom.), and that too not in ranli, but, in accordance with the primary meaning of $\pi \rho \omega \tau$ óroкоs and the immediate context, - in time; тиขิтo Єєథ̣̆ äp $\mu \circ$ §ov, Chrys. Theodoret with reason calls attention to the expres-
 $\pi \rho \delta ̀ \pi \alpha ́ \nu \tau \not \omega \nu$ : contrast John i. 14 є่ $\nu$ à̀ $\tau \hat{\psi} \sigma \nu \nu$ ย́ $\sigma \tau$.] 'consist in Him,' as the causal sphere of their continuing existence : not exactly identical with èv aủz $\hat{\omega}$ above (Mey., Alf.), but, with the very slight change which the clange of verb in. volves, in more of a causal ref-; Christ was the conditional element of their creation, the causal element of theit persistence ; comp. Heb. i. 3, ф́́ $\rho \omega \omega \nu \tau \in \tau$ d̀ $\pi a ́ v \tau \alpha$
 claration, as Waterl. observes, is in fact tantamount to 'in IIm they live, and move, and have their being' (Serm. on Div. vir. Vol. II. p. 164), which is and forms one of the great arguments for the omnipresence and the preserving and sustaining power of Clurist ; see ib. Def. Qu. xvili. Vol. I. p. 430. The verb ouviatával is well defined by Reiske, Ind. Dem. (quoted by Mcyer), as 'corpus unum, integrum, perfectum, secum consentiens esse et permanere,' compare 2 Pet. iii. 5, and [Arist.] de Mundo, 6,
 $\nu \epsilon \in \tau \eta \kappa \in \nu$; see especially Kirebs, Obs. p. 334, and Loesner, Obs. p. 362, by both of whom this word is copiously illustrated from Josephus and Philo ; compare also Elsner, Obs. Vol. II. 259.
18. kal aủtós к.т.入.] Transition to the second part, in which the relation of tho incarnate and glorified Son to His Church is declared and confirmed, not perhaps without some reference to the crroncous teaching and angcl-worship that apparently prevailed in the Church of Colossw. Aùrds is thus, as before, emphatic, possibly involving an antithe

sis to some falsely imagined $\kappa є \phi a \lambda \grave{\eta}$ or $\kappa \in \phi$ алаl of the Church；＇He in whom all things consist， He ，and no other than He ， is the head of the Church．＇The empha－ sis，as Meyer observes，rests on $\kappa \in \phi \alpha \lambda \eta_{1}$ rather than éккえそ ${ }^{\prime} \alpha$ ；it was the head－ ship of the Church，not its imaginary constitution，that formed the undercur－ rent of the erroncous teaching．
$\tau$ о̂ $\sigma \omega$＇$\mu$ ．т $\hat{\eta} s$ ѐкк $\kappa$ ．］＇of His body， the Church，＇т $\hat{\mathrm{\eta}} \mathrm{~s}$ èккл．being the genitive of identity or apposition；see Winer，Gr． § 59.8 ，p．470，Scheuerl．Synt．§ 12．1， 1）．32．The apostle does not say merely ＇of the Church，＇but＇of His body，＇cte．， to show，－not the $\phi i \lambda \alpha \nu i \rho \rho \omega \pi i a$ of Christ
 Chrys．），but the real，vital，and essen－ tial union between the Church and its Head ：compare Ephes．iv．15，16，and notes in loc．；see also Rom．xii．5， 1 Cor． x．17，Ephes．i．23，al．
ös
$\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \iota \nu]$＇seeing $H e ~ i s$ ；＇the relative having a semi－argumentative force，and serving to confirm the previous declara－ tion ；see Jelf，Gram．§836．3．We can scarcely say that in such sentences＇os is for öтl＇（Jelf，l．c．，Matth．GYr．§ 480. c），but rather that，like the more usual ó $\sigma \tau \iota s$ ，the simple relatival force passes into the explanatory，which almost neces－ sarily involves some tinge of a causal or argumentative meaning：see notes on Gal．ii． 4.
$\dot{\alpha} \rho \chi \chi^{\text {и }}$＇the beginning，＇not merely in ref．to the fol－ lowving $\tau \omega \bar{\omega} \nu$ vєkpêv（Meycr，Hofmann， Schriftb．Vol．Ir．1，p． 241 ；compare Theod．），nor even to the spiritual resur－ rection（Daven．），both of which seem too limited；nor yet，with a general and abstract reference，the＇first creative prin－ ciple＇（Steig．，Huth．；compare Clem．－ Alcx．Strom．1v．p．638，$\delta$ Өєds $\delta$ Ł̀ ă $\nu \alpha \rho-$
 the more immediate context and the ref－ erence to our Lord＇s Headship of His

Church scem certainly to suggest，in ref． to the new creation（comp Calv．，Corn． a Lap．； 2 Cor．v．17，Gal．vi．17），the following $\pi \rho \omega \tau$ óтокоs є̇к $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \nu \in \kappa \rho$ ．serv－ ing to define that relation more closely， and to preserve the retrospective allusion to $\pi \rho \omega \tau$ ór．in ver． 15 ：our Lord in His glorified humanity is the $\dot{\alpha} \rho \chi \eta \gamma \dot{\partial}$ s $\tau \hat{i}, s$ § $\omega \hat{\text { ñs }}$（ Acts iii．15）to His Church，the be－ ginning，source，origin and of the new and spiritual，even as He was of the former and material，creation；see Olsh．and Bisp．in loc．，and compare Usteri，Lehrb． 11．2，4，p．304．The plausible reading àapx $\eta$ ，adopted by Chrys．and a fcw mss．，is a limiting gloss suggested by the next clause compared with 1 Cor． xv．23．The omission of the article［in－ serted in B，67＊＊］before áp $\rho \grave{\eta}$ is due， not to the abstract form of the word （Olshans．），but simply to the preceding verb subst．，Middl．Gr．Art．IIr．3． 2.
$\pi \rho \omega \tau \delta \tau$ ．＇̇к $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \nu \in \kappa \rho \bar{\omega} \nu]$＇first－ born from the dead；＇not exactly identi－ cal with $\pi \rho \omega \tau \hat{\sigma}$ ．$\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \nu \varepsilon \kappa \rho \hat{\omega} \nu$, Rev．i． 5 （partitive gen．），but with the proper force of the preposition，＇the first－born，not only of，hut out of the dead；＇He left their realm and came again as with a new begetting and new birth into life （see especially Andrewes，Serm．Yol． III．p．57）；he was the true $\dot{\alpha} \pi a \rho \chi \grave{\geqslant} \tau \bar{\omega} \nu$ $\kappa \in \kappa о \not \mu \eta \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \omega \nu, 1$ Cor．xv．23：compare Hofmann，Schriftb．Vol．II．1，p． 241. Others had been translated or had risen to die again，He had risen with glorified humanity to die no more（Rom，vi．9）： hence He is＇not called simply the first that rose，but with a note of gencration， $\pi \rho \omega \tau$ ．＇̇к $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \nu є \kappa \rho \omega ̂ \nu, ' ~ P e a r s o n, ~ C r e e d, ~$ Vol．I．p． 136 （ed．Burt．）．
ఫva $\gamma$＇́vŋra九 к．$\tau$ ．$\lambda$ ．］＇in order that in all things He might become（not＇sit，＇ Vulg．）pre－eminent，might take the first place，＇＇primas teneat，＇Beza，Daven．；

$\kappa \lambda \eta \sigma l a ̨ \pi \rho \omega ิ \tau o s, \dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau \hat{\eta} \dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha \sigma \tau \alpha ́ \sigma \epsilon!\pi \rho \omega ิ \tau o s$, Chrys. : divine purpose (iva has here its full telic force, compare on $E p h$. i. 17) of His boing the $\alpha \rho \chi \eta$ of the new creation, and having the priority in the resurrection, - a divino purpose fulfilled in its temporal, and to be fulfilled in all conceivable relations, when all things are put under His feet, and the kingdom of the world is become the kingdom of the Lord and His Christ (Rev. xi. 15). The tense $\gamma$ fevpral cannot be safely pressed, as in the subj. the force of the aor. is considerably weakened and modified; sce Bernhardy, Synt. x. 9, p. 382. The verb $\pi \rho \omega \tau \epsilon \mathcal{v} \epsilon เ \nu$ is an $\alpha \pi \pi$. $\lambda \in \gamma \delta \mu$. in the N. T., but is not uncommon elsewhere; compare Zech. iv. 7 (Aquil.), Esth. v. 11, 2 Macc. vi. 18, xiii. 15 , invall which passages an idea of $\pi \rho o t i \mu \eta \sigma t s$ scems clearly conveyed. This however does not require a similar meaning to be assigned to $\pi \rho \omega \tau$ ót. (comp. Dc W., Alf.) : $\pi \rho \omega \tau \in \dot{\chi} \epsilon ⿺ \nu$ was to bo the result, $\pi \rho \omega \tau$ ótoк. $\kappa . \tau, \lambda$. was one of the facts which led to it ; compare Meyer in loc.
दे $\nu \pi \hat{a} \sigma \iota \nu]$ 'in all things,' surely not 'inter omnes,' Beza, - a restricted reference that completely mars the majesty of this passage, and contravenes the force of the nenter $\tau \grave{\alpha} \pi \alpha \dot{\nu} \nu \tau \alpha$ in the causal sentence which follows. Lastly, aủdos, as above, must not be left unnoticed; 'si quis alius mortem debellasset, etc., tum Christus non tenuisset primatum in omnibus,' Daven. We may observe that with this clause the predications respecting Christ seem here to reach their acme (comp. 1 Cor. xv. 28), and lead us to admit, if not to expect, a modification of subj. in the causal sentence which follows.
19. ö $\tau$ t] 'because;' confirmation of the divino purpose in reference to Christ's precedence $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \pi \tilde{\alpha} \sigma t \nu$ : He in whom the
 pleased to reside, must needs have had

His precedence in all things eternally. designed and contemplated.
$\vec{\epsilon} \nu \quad \alpha \cup \tau \hat{\varphi}]$ ' in Him,' and in Him specially; counected with кatokeiv, and put carly forward in the sentence to receive full emphasis. The reference, as the context seems to show, is now more especially to the incarnate Son.
$\epsilon \dot{u} \delta$ óк $\eta \sigma \in \nu \kappa$ к. $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$.] ' the whole fulness (of the Gochead) was pleased to divell ;' ' in ipso complacuit omuis plenitudo inhabitare,' Clarom. 'The first difficulty in this profound verse is to decide on the grammatical subject of єن̇סokєiv. This verb, a late and probably MacedonianGreek word (Sturz, de Dial. Maced. p. 167), has four constructions in the N. T., all personal ; with év and a dat. (Matth. iii. 17 , xvii. 5 , al. : 2 Thessalon. ii. 12 is doubtful), with eis and an accus. (2 Pet. i. 17), with a simplo accus. (Heb. x. 6, 8), with an infin. referring to the subject (Rom. xv. 12, 1 Corin. i. 21, al., - the principal and prevailing use in St. Paul's Epp.) ; sec Fritz. Rom. x. 1, Vol. II. p. 369 sq ., where the uses of evi $\delta o r$. are fully investigated. In the present case three subjects have been proposed ; (a) Xpioros, tho preceding subject, Tertull. Dfarc. v. 19, and recently Conyb., and Hofm. Scliriftb. Vol. II. 1, p. 242, where it is fairly defended ; (b) $\Theta$ єós, supplied from the context ; so, it can scarcely be doubted, Syr., Vulg., Goth., Theod., and, by inference, Chrysost., Theoph., and after them the bulk of modern expositors; (c) tho expressed subject $\tau \delta \pi \hat{a} \nu \pi \lambda \hbar \eta \rho \omega$ $\mu \alpha$; Clarom., Copt., apparently Eth., and recently Pcile, and, very decidedly, Scholef. Hints, p. 108. Of these (a) involves indirect opposition to strong analogies of Scripture (e.g. 2 Cor. v. 19), and, equally with (b), a harsh change of sulject to the two infin. : the second (b) is dogmatically correct, but involves a very unusual construction of eủסok. (comp.



Polyb. Hist. 1. 8. 4. vir. 4. 5, 2 Macc. xiv. 35), a different subject to кaтoוк. and $\dot{\alpha} \pi \cup \kappa$., and further an cllipsis of a word, which though not without classical parallel (see Julf, Gr. § 373. 3) would here, in a passage of this dogmatical importance, be in a very high degree unnatural and improbable : tho third (c) is syntactically simple, it is also in harmony with St. Paul's regular usage of ev̀oore. when associated with an infin., and, - what is still more important, - both in its causal connection, the nature of the expressions, and the order of the words (Meycr's assertion that it would have been öтє $\pi \hat{\alpha} \nu \tau \delta \pi \lambda$. $\epsilon \hat{\nu} \delta$. $\kappa . \tau, \lambda$. falls to the ground ; observe also the order in 1 Cor. i. 21, x. 5, Galat. i. 15), stands in closest parallel with the authoritative interpretation in ch. ii. 9,
 t $\eta$ tos $\sigma \omega \mu$. We seem bound then to abide by ( $c$ ), - possibly the interpretat. of the ancient Latin Church : it involves, however, as will be seen, some grave, though apparently not insuperable, difficulties. $\quad \pi \hat{\alpha} \nu \tau \delta \pi \lambda \hat{\eta}-$ $\rho \omega \mu a]$ ' the whole fulness (of the Godhead ),' 'omnes divinæ naturæ divitiæ,' Fritz. These words have been very differently explained. Lexically considered, $\pi \lambda \hat{\jmath} p \omega \mu \boldsymbol{a}$ has three possible meanings, one active, ( $\alpha$ ) implendi actio, and two passive, $(\beta)$ id quod impletum est, Ephes. i. 23 (see notes), and the more common $(\gamma)$ id quo res impletur, Gal. iv. 4, Ephes. iii. 9 (see notes on both pas. sages), which again often passes into the neutral and derivative $\left(\gamma_{1}\right)$ affuentia, abundantia, $\pi \lambda 0$ ûtos, - especially in connection with abstract genitives, Rom. xv. 29; see Fritz. Rom. xi. 12, Vol. II. p. 469 sq., Hofmann, Schrifib. Vol. II. 1, p. 26. Of these $\left(\gamma_{1}\right)$, or perhaps simply $(\gamma)$, is alone exegetically admissible. The real difficulty is in the supplemental
gen. Setting aside all doubtful and arbitrary explanations, e.g. ékкл $\eta \sigma_{i}^{\prime}$ (Theod., Sever.), 'fulness of the Gentiles' (Schleierm.), 'fulness of the universe' (Conyb., Hofm. l. c., p. 26), we have only one authoritative supplement, i $\uparrow \delta$ т $\eta$ ros, either exactly in the same sense as in ch. ii. 9, 'plenitudo Deitatis,' or in the more derivative sense, 'plenitudo gratix habitualis' (compare Davenant, Mey., al.). The latter of these is adopted by those who advocate construction (b) of è̇ठoк., but has this great disadvantage, that it involves two interpretations of $\pi \lambda \eta$ п́p $\omega \mu \alpha$ งcót. (here in ref. to 'divina gratia,' there to 'divina essentia,' so Mey., Alf., al.), whereas on the constr. of $\epsilon \dot{v} \delta o \kappa$. already adopted, $\pi \lambda \nmid f$. will naturally be the same in both cases, and will imply ' the complete fulness and exhaustless perfection of the Divine Essence,' the plenitudo Deitatis,' - an abstract term of transcendent significance, involving in itself the more concrete $\Theta \epsilon \delta s$, which, as will be seen, scems possibly to be the subject of the following participial clause.

When we consider the context in ch. ii. 9, there seem grave reasons for thinking that St. Paul chose this august expression with special reference to some vague or perverted meaning assigned to it by the false teachers and theosophistic speculators at Colossæ ; comp. Thorndike, Cov. of Grace, 11. 15. 12. $\kappa \alpha \tau о \leqslant \kappa \hat{\eta} \sigma \alpha \downarrow]$ ' to dwell;' a term especially applied to the indwelling influence of the Father (compare Eph. ii. 22), the Son (EPph. iii. 17), and the Spirit (James iv. 5), and both here and ch. ii. 9 , enhancing the personal relations involved in the mysterious word $\pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \rho \omega \mu \alpha$; èкє̂̂ ひ̈́cท $\sigma \in \nu$ oủk

 concile all things ; not 'prorsus reconciliare,' Mey. (compare Chrys., кат $\eta \lambda \lambda a \gamma$.

 natural force of àmò in similar com-
 'in pristinam conditionern reconciliando reducere;' see Winer, de Verb. Comp. iv. p. 7, 8. The subject of the inf. is of course the same as that of катонк., i. e., grammatically considered, the $\pi \lambda$ ท̂p $\omega \mu \alpha$ above, but exegetically, - as the following aủzòv and other scriptural analogies (compare 2 Cor. v. 19, Eph. i. 10) seem to suggest, the more definite $\Theta \in \sigma^{\prime}$, involved and included in the more mystical and abstract designation. The revelation contained in these words is of the most profound nature, and must be interpreted with the utmost caution and reverence. Without presuming to dilute, or to assign any improper 'elasticity' (Mcy.) to, the significant àmoкат. (e. g. 'reunionem creaturarum inter se invicem,' Dallæus), or to limit the comprehensive and unrestrictel $\tau \grave{\alpha} \pi \alpha \nu \tau \alpha$ (e. g. 'universam Ecclesiam,' Beza, 'omnes homines,' Corn. a Lap.), we must guard against the irreverence of farreaching speculations on the reconciliation of the finito and the infinite (Usteri, Lelub. 11. 1. 1, p. 129, Marhcincke, Dogm. § 331 sq. ), to which this mighty declaration has been supposed to allude. This, and no less than this, it does say,that the eternal and incarnate Son is the 'causa medians' by which the absolute totality of created things shall be restored into its primal harmony with its Creator, - a declaration more specifically unfolded in the following clause: more than this it does not say, and where God is silent it is not for man to speak. See the sober remarks of Hofmann, Schrifib. Vol. I. p. 188 sq. The mysterious àvaкефалаıш́бабงal, Ephes. i. 10 (obs. both the prep. and the voice), is a more general and perhaps more developed, while 2 Cor. v. 19, кó $\rho \mu \nu$ катал入. is a more
limited and more specific, representation of the same eternal truth : see Destiny of Creature, p. 85 sq. $\quad$ is $\alpha u ̇ \tau \delta$ ] 'unto Himself,' i.e. to God, couched in the foregoing $\pi \lambda \eta p \omega \mu a$ : a 'preguans constructio,' - the preposition marking the reconciled access to (comp. Eph. ii. 18), and union with the Creator; compare Winer, Gri. § 66. 2, p. 547. The simple dative (Eph. ii. 16 ; compare Rom. v. 10, 2 Cor. v. 19, al.) expresses the object to whom and for whom the action is directed, but leaves the further idea conveyed by the prep. unnoticed. There is no need to read aítóv (Griesb., Scholz), as the reference to the subject is unemphatic; see notes
 $\sigma a s]$ 'having made peace; ' i. e. God,a simple and intelligible change of gender suggested by the preceding aủtor and the personal subject involved in the subst. with which the participle is grammatically connected; in fact, ' $a$ con-

 $\nu \eta \nu$, would almost seem to justify a reference to the Son (Theod., CEcumen.) by the common participial anacoluthon (Steiger; compare Wincr, Gr. § 63. 2, p. 505 ), but as this would seriously dislocate the sentence by separating tho modal participial clause from the finite verb, and would introduce confusion among the pronouns, we retain the more simple and direct construction. Thus then the two constructions $(b)$ and $(c)$ noticed in ver. 19 ultimately coincide in referring verse 20 to God, not Christ; and it is worthy of thought whether the ancient Syr. and Clarom. Vv. may not, by different grammatical processes, exhibit a traditional ref. of ver. 20 to God, of a very remote, and perhaps even authoritative antiquity.
$\delta$ ıd
$\tau \circ \hat{v} a^{l} / \mu$. $\tau \circ \hat{v} \cdot \sigma \tau \alpha v \rho$.] 'by theblood of

## 

You who were alienated He rcconciled by His death，
 if at least ye remain tirm in the faith and abide by the hope of the Gospel．
（i．e．shed upon）the cross ；＇more specific and circumstantial statement of the＇cau－ sa merlians＇of the reconciliation．The gen．is what is termed of＇remoter ref－ crence，＇forming in fact a species of bre－ viloquentia：see especially Winer，$G r$ ． § 30.2 ，p．168，where numerous exam－ ples are collected．
$\alpha \dot{v} \tau 0 \hat{0}]$＇by Mim；＇it is scarcely neces－ sary to say that $\delta \iota^{\prime}$ aủtoû does not refer to the inmediately preceding $\delta i \grave{\alpha}$ toû aif．，but to the more remote $\delta i i^{\prime}$ aùrov̂ of which it is a vivid and emphatic repeti－ tion．These words are omitted in some MSS．［BD1FGL； 10 mss．］，but almost obviously to facilitate the construction．
 the things upon the earth or the things in the hearens ；＇disjunctive enumeration of the＇universitas rerum，＇as in ver．16， with this only difference，that the order is transposed，－possibly from the more close comnection of the death of Christ with $\tau \grave{\alpha}$ ènl $\tau \hat{\eta} s \gamma \hat{\eta} s$ ．It is hardly neces－ sury to say that the language precludes any idea of reconciliation between the oc－ cuppants of earth and heaven（apparently Cyril．－Hicros．Catech．xiv．3，Chrys．（in part），Theod．，al．）or，in reference to the latter，of any reconciliation of only a retrospectively preservative nature （13ramhall，Disc．iv．Vol．v．p．148）． How the reconciliation of Christ affects the spiritual world－whether by the an－ nihilation of＇posse peccare，＇or by the infusion of a more perfect knowledge （ E ph．iii．10），or（less probably）some restorative application to the fallen spir－ itual world（Orig．，Neand．Planting，Vol． 1．p． 531 ），－we know not，and we dare not speculate：this，however，we may fearlessly assert，that the efficacy of the sacrifice of the Eternal Son is infinite and limitless，that it extends to all things
in earth and heaven，and that it is the blessed medium by which，between God and His creatures，whether angelical， human，animate，or inanimate（Rom． viii． 19 sq．），peace is wrought ；see the valuable note of Harless on Eph．i．10， especially p． 52 ，Hofmann，Schriflu．Vol． I．p．189，and comp．Wordsw．in loc．
21．кal $\dot{\nu} \mu \mathrm{a} s$ ］＇and you also：＇new clause，to be separated by a period（not merely by a comma，Lachm．，Bisp．）fiom ver． 20 ，descriptive of the application of the universal reconciliation to the special case of the Colossians ；compare ch．ii． 13，and see notes on Eph．ii．1．The structure involves a slight anacoluthon ： the apostle probably commenced with the intention of placing $\dot{v} \mu \mathrm{a} s$ under the immediate regimen of áтокатй $\lambda \lambda$ ．，but was led by потè övтas into the contrasted clause $\nu$ vol $\delta \grave{\text { è before he inserted the verb；}}$ compare Winer，Gram．§ 63.1 ，p． 504. The reading àтокат $\eta \lambda \lambda \alpha \alpha^{\gamma} \eta \tau \in$ adopted by Lackm．and Meyer with B［DIFG；Cla－ rom．；Iren．，al．，have àтоката入入аүévтєs］ involves an equally intelligible，though much stronger anacoluthon，but has not sufficient external support．
ơvт $\alpha$ s à $\pi \eta \lambda \lambda о \tau \rho$ ．］＇being alienatcd，＇ ＇being in a state of alienation，＇scil．＇from God；＇compare Eph．iv．28．The part． of the verb subst．is used with the perf． part．to express yet more forcibly the continuing state of the alienation；com－ pare Winer，Gr．§ 45．5，p．511．For illustrations of the emphatic verb àma入入． （＇abalienati，＇Beza），see notes on Eph ． ii．12，where the application is more ex－ pressly restricted．Both there and Eph． iv．28，the Ephesians were represented as a portion of heathenism，here the Co－ lossians are represented as a portion of the＇universitas rerum，＇to whom the． redeeming power of Christ extends．


$\hat{\epsilon} \chi \hat{\vartheta} \rho \circ$ v̀s $\tau \hat{\eta} \delta \iota \alpha \nu$.] ' enemies in your understanding;' not passive, 'regarded as enemies by God' (Meyer, who compares Rom. v. 10), but, as the subjective tinge given by the limiting dative and the addition ${ }^{2} \nu$ toîs ${ }^{\circ} \rho \gamma$. seem to imply,

 סlavola is what is termed the dat. of reference to (see notes on Gal. i. 22), and represents, as it were, the peeculiar spiritual seat of the hostility (comp. notes on Eph. iv. 18), while èv toîs ěpyots marks the practical spheres and substrata in which the ex $\chi$ apa was evinced; comp. Huther in loc. On the meaning of fodaoca, the 'higher intellectual nature ' ( $\delta \iota \epsilon$ '́cooos $\lambda 0$ $\gamma \iota k$, Orig.), especially as shown in its practieal relations (contrast द̌vyota, Heb). iv. 12), see the good remarks of Beck, Seelenl. ir. 19. b, p. 58.

The
addition roîs movppoîs, not simply èv roîs $\pi o \nu$. द̌p . $_{\text {., serves to }}$ to give emphasis, and direct attention to the real character of the épra; Winer, G'r. § 20. 1, p. 119. $\nu v \nu$ \} $\delta \dot{\epsilon}$ à токат.] 'yet now hath He (God, see next note) reconciled:' antitl-
 positive $\bar{\delta}$ è in the apodosis being evoked by the latent 'although' (Donalds. Gr. § 621) involved in the participial protasis ; compare Xen. Men. iII. 7. 8, ėкél-

 and see the note and reff. of Kühner, also Buttmann, MFid. Excurs. xir. p. 148 : add Klotz, Derar. Vol. ir. p. 374, Hartung, Partil.. סé, 5. 6, Vol. x. p. 186. Such a construction is not common in Attic writers. In this union of the emphatic particle of abselutely present time with the aor. (comp. Hartung, Partik. Vol. 1I. p. 24) the aor. is not equivalent to a pres. or perf., but marks with the proper force of the tense, that the action
followed a given event (here, as the context suggests, the atoning death of Christ), and is now done with ; see Donalds. Gr. § 433, compared with Fritz. de Aor. p. 6, 17. Meyer pertinently compares Plato, Symp. p. 193 A, $\pi \rho \delta$


22. $\bar{\epsilon} \nu \tau \hat{\varphi} \sigma \hat{\omega} \mu . \quad \kappa . \tau . \lambda$.$] 'in the$ body of His flesh,' i.e., as the language and allusion undoubtedly requires, - the flesh of Christ ; the prep. ev pointing to the substratum of the action ; see notes on Gal. i. 24, and comp. especially Andoc. de Myst. p. 33 (ed. Schill.) $\delta \mu \hat{\mu} \nu$ à $\gamma \grave{\omega} \nu$
 may justly be considered somewhat doubtful whether the subject of the present clause, and of the verb àтокатŋ่入$\lambda a \xi \in \nu$ is regarded as Christ (Chrysost., ©cum., al.), or God. In favor of the first supposition we have the use of $\sigma \hat{\omega}^{-}$ $\mu a \tau \iota$ (which scems to suggest an identity between the subject to which the $\sigma \hat{\omega} \mu \boldsymbol{\alpha}$ refers and the subject of the verb), perhaps the use of $\pi a p a \sigma \tau \hat{\eta} \sigma$ au ( comp . Eph. v. 27, but contrast 2 Cor. iv. 14), and the ready connection of such a purpose with the fact specified by àmorar. (comp. De Wette), and lastly, the semi-parallel passage, Eph. ii. 13. Still the difficulty of a change of subject, - the natural transition from the more general act on the part of God alluded to in ver. 20 to the more particular application of the same to the Colossians, - the fuller amplification which this verse seems to be of the substance of ver. 13, - and the similarity between the circumstantial סid $\tau o \hat{v}$ ailu. $\tau o \hat{v} \sigma \tau$. above and the cir-
 present verse, seem to supply distinctly preponderant arguments, and lead us with Bengel, Huth., and others, to refer àmoкат. to the subject of ver. $20, i$ i. e. to

## 

God. Many reasons have been assigned why St. Paul adds the specifying gen. (substantice, Winer, Gr. § 30. 2) Tท̂s $\sigma a \rho-$ кós. Two opinions deserve consideration; (a) that it was to oppose some forms of Docetic error which were prevailing at Colosse, Steiger, Huther, al.; (b) that it was directed against a fulse spiritualism, which, from a mistaken asceticism (ch. ii. 23), led to grave error with respect to the efficacy of Christ's atonement in the flesh; so Meyer, followed by Alford. As there are no direct, and appy. no indirect (contrast Ignat. Magnes. § 9, 11, al.) allusions to Docetic error traceable in this Epistle, the opinion (b) is, on the whole, to be preferred. That the addition is used to mark the distinction between this and the Lord's spiritual $\sigma \hat{\omega} \mu a$, the Church (Olsh.), does not seem natural or probable. $\delta \iota \dot{\alpha} \tau 0 \hat{v}$ શิ $\alpha \nu$.$] 'by$ means of His death;' added to the preceding ëv $\tau \hat{\varphi} \sigma \dot{\omega} \mu$. to express the means by which the reconciliation was so wrought: it was by means of death, borne in, and accomplished in that blessed body, that reconciliation was brought about; compare some valuable remarks in Jackson, Creed: viri. 8. 4.
$\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \sigma \tau \hat{\eta} \sigma \alpha l_{\text {] ' ' o present; ' infinitive, }}$ expressing the actual purpose and intent of the action expressed in $\dot{\alpha} \pi о \kappa_{4}$; see Madvig, Synt. §. 118 , where this mood is extremely well discussed. Had $\ddot{\sigma} \sigma \tau \epsilon$ been inserted, the idea of manner or degree would rather have come into prominence (Madvig, § 166 ), and the meaning would literally have been ' as with the intention of, etc.,' the finite verb being in fact again tacitly supplied after $\check{\omega} \sigma \tau \epsilon$; sce especially Weller, Bemerl. $z$. Griech. Synt. p. 14 (Mein. 1843). Meyer calls attention to the tense, but it must be observed that in the infin. the aorist, except after verbs declarandivel sentiendi,
is commonly obscured (Madvig, § 172), especially as here in an aoristic sequence. On $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \sigma \tau \hat{\eta} \sigma a l$, which certainly conveys no sacrificial idea, comp. on Eph. v. 27. There the reference is more restricted, here more general.
$\dot{\alpha} \gamma$ \{ovs кal $\dot{\alpha} \mu$. каl $\dot{\alpha} \nu \in \gamma \kappa$.] 'holy and blameless and without charge;' designation of their contemplated state on its positive and negative side (Mey.), árious marking the former, ${ }^{\circ} \mu \omega \mu_{\circ}$ каl ${ }^{2} \nu \in \gamma \kappa \lambda$. the latter. Strictly considered then, the first and second kal are not perfectly coordinate and similar: they do not connect three different ideas (' erga Deum, respectu vestri, respectu proximi,' Bengel) nor simply aggregate three similar ideas (Daven.) ; but, while the first connects the two members of the latent antithesis, the second is, as it were, under a vinculum joining the component parts of the second member. On the meaning of áp $\mu \mu$ s. (inculpatus, not immaculatus), see notes on $E$ ph. i. 4 : it is apparently less strong than the following ${ }^{2} \nu \in \gamma \kappa \lambda$.;


 Lastly, on the distinction between $\dot{\alpha} \nu \nu^{\prime} \gamma-$ кえŋ $\eta$ tos and à $\nu \in \pi i \lambda \eta \pi t o s$ (' in quo nulla justa causa sit reprehensionis '), sce Titt. mann, Synon. 1. p. 31.
 God, - not Christ (Mey.), a reference neither. natural nor easily, reconcilable with the very similar passage, Eph. i. 4. There may be here a faint reference to the 'day of Christ's appearing,' Alford, but it does not seem perfectly certain from the context. With respect to the question whether 'sanctitas imputala' (Huth.), or, perhaps more probably, 'sanctitas inhcerens,' (Chrys.; compare notes on Eph. i. 4) is here alluded to, the remark of Davenant scems just, 'cum dicit, ut. sistat nos sanctos, non ut

## 


sisteremus nos, manifestum est ipsos reconciliatos et renatos sanctitatem suam a Christo mutuari, sive do actuali, sive de inherente, sive de imputatà loquimur,' p. 113 (ed. 3); 'whensoever we have any of these we have all, - they go together,' Hooker, Serm. on Justification, II. 21.
23. $\epsilon\rceil \gamma \in \epsilon \in \pi \imath \mu$. $\tau \hat{\eta} \pi\{\sigma \tau \in \ell$ ] 'if at least ye continue in the faith;' a tropical use of $\bar{\pi} \pi \mu$. peculiar to St. Paul, Iiom. vi. 1, xi. $22,23,1$ Tim. iv. 16 : $\grave{i} \pi \mu \mu$., Acts xiii. 43 (Rec.), has scarcely any critical support. Like several compounds of $\dot{e} \pi i$ it has two constructions (see Winer, Grr. §52.7. p. 382); with prepositions èmí, $\pi p \dot{\rho}$, èv $\quad$ (Acts xxviii. 14, 1 Cor. xvi. 17, Phil. i. 24), and with the simple dative (Rom. ll. ce., 1 Tim. l.c.) which apparently is semilocal (comp, on Gal. v. 1), or, perhaps more probably, under the influence of the preposition. The preposition $\bar{\pi} \boldsymbol{\pi} \boldsymbol{l}$ is not (per se) intensive (Alf.), but appears to denote rest at a place, see notes on Gal. i. 18. On the meaning of ě̌є, see notes on Eph. iii. 2, and on the distinction between eir $\epsilon$ (si quidem) and èiтep (si omnino), see notes on Gal. iii. 4. $\quad \tau \in \mathcal{N} \in \mu \in \lambda$. кat $\mathfrak{E} \delta \rho a \hat{i} 0 t]$ 'grounded and firm;' specification on the positive side of the mode of the $\overline{\text { En }} \boldsymbol{\pi} \mu \nu \nu \eta$; compare Eph. iii.
 Cor. xv. 58, éfpaîot, д̀ $\mu \epsilon \tau \alpha к i ́ l y \tau о$. The qualitative termination -atos seems to justify the distinction of Beng., ' $\tau \in \uparrow \tau \mu$. affixi fundamento, $\mathfrak{\varepsilon} \bar{\rho}$. stabiles, firmi intus.' That there is any reference to the metaphor of a temple (Oish.), seems here very doubtful.

кal $\mu \grave{\eta} \mu \in \tau \alpha \kappa \iota \nu$.] 'and not being mored away;' nearly identical with à $\mu \epsilon \tau \pi{ }^{2} i v \eta-$ Tot, 1 Cor. גv. 58 , and representing their fixity on its negative side : the change to the present pass., -as marking by the
tense the process that might be going on, and by the mood (pass., not act., as De Wette), that of which they were now liable to be the victims, - is especially suitable and exact; see the suggestive example cited by Alford, viz. Xenoph.

 $\mu \grave{\eta}$ with $\mu \epsilon \tau \alpha \kappa$., which, in a hypothetical sentence like the present, is usual and proper, see, if necessary, Winer, Gram. §55. 1, p. $522 . \quad \tau \hat{\eta} s$ ह̇ $\lambda \pi$. $\tau 0 \hat{v} \in \dot{\Delta} \alpha \gamma \gamma$.] 'the hope of the Gospel,' i. e. arising from, evoked by, the Gospel, $\tau o \hat{v}$ evary. being the genitive of the origin or rather the originating agent ; see Hartung, Casus, p. 17, and comp. notes on 1 Thess. i. 6. To regard it as a possess. gen. (Alf.) gives an unnecessary vagueness to the expression. Such genitives as those of the oriyin (Hartung, p. 17), originating agent, and perhaps a shade stronger, the causa efficiens (Scheuerl. Synt. $\$ 17$ ), all belong to the general category of the gen. of 'ablation' (Donalds. G'r. § 448, 449) : the context alone must guide us in our choice. 'EA$\pi i s$ can hardly be here, except in a very derivative sense, equivalent to $\delta$ X $\rho$ ta $\sigma \delta s$, Chrys. ; it seems only to have its usual subjective meaning ; compare notes on
 ' which ye heard,' scil. when it was first preached to you; not 'have heard,' Auth., - here certainly an unnecessary introduction of the auxiliary. This and the two following clauses serve to give
 por: they had beard the Gospel, the world had heard it ( $\pi$ d̀̉ıl aùroùs ф'́pet
 and he the writer of this Epistle, - who though probably not their founder (see on verse 7), yet stood in close relation to them through Epaphras, - was the

#   

 am preaching the mystery of salvation, and striving to present every man perfect before Christ.
 тov $\sigma v \nu \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \hat{\imath}$, Chrys. The apostle gives weight to his assertions by the special mention of his name, 2 Cor x. 1, Gal. v. 2, Eph. iii. 1, 1 Thess. ii. 18, Philem. 19.
$\dot{\epsilon} \nu \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \boldsymbol{\eta} \kappa \tau\{\sigma \in \ell]$ 'in the hearing of every creature;' surely not 'in the whole of creation,' Alf., - a translation which, even if we concedo that $\pi \hat{a} \sigma a$ kтlots may be equivalent to 'every form of creation,' i. e. 'all creatures' (Hofm. Scleriftb. Vol. r. p. 137), would be needlessly inexact. The art. is inserted in $\mathrm{D}^{3}$ EKL (Rec.), but clearly has not sufficient critical support. This noble hyperbole only states in a slightly different form what the Lord had commanded, Mark xvi., 15 : the inspired apostle, as Olsh. well says, sces the universal tendency of Christianity already realized. The limitation, $\tau \hat{\eta} \hat{\iota} \pi \delta \partial \delta \partial \nu$ où $\rho$. characterizes the кríøıs as $\dot{\epsilon} \pi i \gamma \in t o s$, including however, thereby, all mankind. For the meaning of $\epsilon \nu$, apud, coram, perhaps here with singular reverting somewhat to the primary idea of sphere of opleration, see Wincr, Gr. §48. a. d, r.34. $\delta \iota \alpha$ кovos] ' $\alpha$ minister;' see notes on Ephes. iii. 7. The three practical deductions which Davenant draws from this clause are worthy of perusal.
24. $\nu \hat{v} \nu \chi \propto\{\rho \omega]$ Transition suggested by the preceding clauses, especially by the last, to the apostle's own services in the causo of the Gospel. The $\nu \hat{v} \nu$ is not merely transitional (compare Klotz, Devar. Vol. II. p. 677), but, as its position shows, purely temporal and emphatic (2 Corinth. vii. 9), 'now, with the chain round my wrist' (Eadie), forming a contrast with the past time involved in


The reading ôs $\nu \hat{v} \nu \kappa . \tau . \lambda$. (DiE1FG; Vulg., Clarom., al.) seems either due to the preceding letters, or was intended to keep up the supposed connection between ver. 25 and ver. 23.

## $\epsilon \nu$

$\pi \alpha \wedge \dot{n} \mu \alpha \sigma \iota \nu$ ] Not exclusively 'de iis quæ patior,' Beza, but simply 'in passionibus,' Vulg. ; the $\pi \alpha \star$ n' $\mu$ ara were not only the subject whereupon he rejoiced, but the sphere, the circumstances in which he did so ; $\chi$ aípo $\pi \alpha \dot{\sigma} \sigma \chi \omega \nu$, Chrys. The brief and semi-adverbial ėv toúre (Phil. i. 18) is perhaps slightly different. The omission of the article before $\dot{\tilde{\pi} \epsilon \mathrm{\epsilon} \rho}$ $\hat{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ arises from $\pi \alpha ́ \sigma \chi \in \epsilon \nu$ vimè $\rho$ being a legitimate construction; see notes on Eph. i. 15. $\quad \dot{v} \pi \dot{\epsilon} \rho \hat{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu]$ 'for your,' not 'in your place,' Steig., nor, with a causal reference, 'on your account,' Eadie, 'vestra causa,' Just. (compare Est. and Corn. a Lap.), but 'vestro fructu et commodo,' Beza, 'zum Vortheil,' Winer, Gr. § 47.1 , p. 342, as the more usual meaning of the prep. in the N. T. and its use below both suggest. On the uses of the preposition compare notes on Gal. i. 4, iii. 13, Phil. i. 7. ג̀ $\nu \tau \alpha \nu \alpha \pi \lambda$. к. $\tau . \lambda$.] 'am filling fully up the lacking measures of the sufferings of Christ.' The meaning of these words has formed the subject both of exegetical discussion and polemical application; compare Cajet. de Indulg. Qu. 3, Bellarmine, de Indulg. Cap. 3. Without entering into the latter, we will endeavor briefly to state the grammatical and contextual meaning of the words.
(1) $\vartheta \lambda \ell \psi \in \iota \varsigma \mathrm{X} \rho \iota \sigma \tau \circ \hat{\nu}$ is clearly not 'afflictiones propter Christum subeundæ,' Elsner (Vol. II. p. 260), Schoettg., al., nor 'calamitates quas Christus perferendas imposuit,' Fritz. (Rom. Vol. III. p. 275), - a somewhat artificial gen.


auctoris, - but simply and plainly ' the afflictions of Christ,' i. e. which appertain to Christ, not, however, with corporeal reference, $\partial \sigma \alpha$ ข́т $\epsilon \mu \epsilon เ \nu \epsilon$, Theod., but which are His (Xp. being a pure possessive genit.; compare Winer, Gr. \& 30 . 2, p. 1\%0, note), of which He is the mystical subject; see below. But (2) how are the $\dot{v} \sigma \tau \in \rho \mu a \tau a$ of these afflictions filled up by the apostle? Not (a) by the endurance of afflictions similar ( $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \alpha u ́ r \omega s$, Theod.) to those endured (úmo$\sigma \tau \alpha \tau \iota \kappa \omega ̂ s)$ by his Master (comp. Heb. xiii. 13, 1 Pet. iv. 13), and by drinking out of the same cup (Matth. xx. 23), as Huth., Mey., - for, independently of all other considerations, the distinctive feature of the Lord's iní $\psi \in t s$, vicarious suffering (Olshaus.), was lacking in those of His
 тол入ои̂ $\gamma \in$ каlे $\delta \in \hat{\imath}$, (Ecum.), - but, (b), in the deeper sense given to it by Chrys., Theoph., Eecum., and recently adopted by De Wette, Eadie, Alf., al., - by the endurance of aflictions which Clurist endures in His suffering Church ( $\sigma \chi \in \tau L^{-}$ $\kappa \bar{\omega} s$ ), and of which the $\pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \rho \omega \mu \alpha$ has not yet come ; see Olsh. in loc., who has well defended this vital and consolatory interpretation, and compare August. in Psalm. lxi. 4, Vol. IV. p. 731 (edit. Migne).
(3) The meaning of $\dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \alpha \nu \alpha \pi \lambda \eta \rho \circ \hat{\nu} \nu$ has yet to be considered; this is not 'vicissim explere' (Beza, compare Tittmann, Synon. Ir. p. 230), nor 'cum Christo calamitates imponente in malis perferendis æmulans' (Fritz.), - a somewhat artificial interpretation, nor even ' alterius v́ $\sigma \tau$ ép $\eta \mu a$ de suo explere' (Winer, de Verb. Comp. III. 22), but, as Mey. suggests, 'to meet,
 ponding $\pi \lambda \hbar p \omega \mu \alpha$; ' the $\dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \grave{l}$ contrasting not the actors or their acts (contrast Xenoph. Hell. 11. 4. 12, à $\nu \tau \alpha \nu \epsilon ́ \pi \lambda \eta \sigma a \nu$ com-
pared with a previous $\dot{\epsilon} \mu \pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \sigma \alpha l)$, but the defect and the supply with which it is met : see the examples cited by Winer; especially Dio Cass. xliv. 8, ठбov èvéס́tı

 [found in FG; mss. : Orig. in allusion] would have expressed nearly the same ; the double compound, however, specifies more accurately the intention of the action, and the circumstances (the $\dot{v} \sigma \tau \in \rho \eta$ $\mu a \tau \alpha)$ which it was intended to meet. For a practical sermon on this text, seo Donne, Sern. xevir. Vol. Iv. p. 261 sq. (ed. Alf.), and compare Destiny of Creature, p. 39 sq. $\begin{gathered}\text { è } \nu \\ \tau \eta\end{gathered}$ $\sigma \alpha \rho \kappa t \quad \mu \circ v$ clearly belongs to $\dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \alpha-$ $\nu a \pi \lambda$., defining more closely the seat, and thence, inferentially, the mode, of the ảvtavar入ท! $\rho \omega \sigma \iota s$ (compare 2 Cor. iv. 11, Gal. iv. 14) ; the word $\sigma a p \xi$, which thus involves the predication of manner, standing, as Meyer acutely observes, in exquisite contrast with the $\sigma \hat{\omega} \mu a$, which defines the object of the action. Steiger, Huther, al., connect this clause with
 ically possible (Winer, Gir.§ 20. 2, p. 123), but is exegetically untenable, as it would but reiterate what is necessarily involved in the use of the first person of the verb.
 As éккл. might be thought the word of importance, the construction $\eta^{\prime \prime} \tau \iota s \in \sigma \tau \iota \nu$ ėkкл., 1 Tim. iii. 15, might have seemed more natural ; compare Winer, Gr. § 24. 3, p. 150. The present construction is, however, perfectly correct, as the article and defining gen. associated with $\sigma \hat{\omega} \mu a$, as well as the antithetical contrast in which it stands with $\sigma \alpha{ }^{\prime} p \xi$, point to $\sigma \hat{\omega} \mu \alpha$ as the subst. on which the chief moment of thought really dwells.
 which I (Paul) became a minister: ' state-

## 

ment of the relation in which he stands to the $\epsilon \kappa \kappa \lambda \eta \sigma$ ia just mentioned, the $\bar{\eta} s$ having a faintly causal, or rather explanatory force (see notes on ver. 18, and Ellendt. Lex. Soph. s. v. Vol.ir. p. 371 ), and indirectly giving the reason and moving principle of the $\alpha \nu \tau a \nu a \pi \lambda \lambda \hat{p} \omega \sigma \sigma t s$; 'I fill up the lacking measures of the sufferings of Christ in behalf of His body the Church, being an appointed minister thereof, and having a spiritual function in it committed to me by God.' The è $\gamma \dot{\omega}$ continues, in a slightly changed relation, the éy $\begin{gathered}\text { חaî̀os of ver. } 23 \text { : there }\end{gathered}$ the $\delta$ tasovia referred to the evar $\gamma$., here to the Church by which the $\epsilon \dot{v} a \gamma \gamma$, is preached; 'idem plane est ministrum' Ecclesir esse et Evangelii,' Just.
$\kappa \alpha \tau \grave{\alpha} \tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ oiko $\kappa, \Theta \in o \hat{v}]^{\text {' }}$ in accordance with the dispensation, i.e. the spiritual


 The somewhat difficult word oikovou. seems here, in accordance with $\tau \eta \nu \quad \delta 0-$ సิєî $\sigma \alpha \nu$ к. $\tau . \lambda$. which follows, to refer, not to the 'disposition of God, Syriac 1 $2 \mathrm{C}{ }^{\lambda}$ 'ragina,' Ath, 'ordinationem,' but, as Just., Mey., al., to the 'spiritual function,' the 'office of an oikovópos' (see 1 Cor. ix. 17, compared with 1 Cor. iv. 1), originating from, or assigned by, God; the more remote gen. ©єoû denoting either the origin of the commission (Hartung, Casus, p. 17), or, with more of a possessive force, Him to whom it belonged and in whose service it was borne: see Reuss, Theol. Chret. Iv. 9, Vol. 1r. p. 93, and notes on Eph. i. 10, where the meanings of oiкоуо $\mu$. in the N . T. are briefly noticed and classified.
 given me for you ; 'further definition of the oikov. тov̂ $\Theta \epsilon o \hat{v}$, the meaning of
which, owing to the different meanings of oikov., might otherwise have been misunderstood: 'this oikovopía was specially assigned to me and you, - you, Gentiles, were to be its objects.' The connection of $\epsilon$ is $\dot{v} \mu a ̂ s$ with $\pi \lambda \eta \rho$. (Scholef. Hints, p. 110) does not seem plausible : the juxtaposition of the pronouns ( $\mu 06$ eis úpâs) suggests their logical connection. $\quad \pi \lambda \eta \rho \hat{\omega} \sigma \alpha \iota \tau \delta \nu$ $\left.\lambda \delta \gamma_{0} \tau 0 \hat{v} \quad \Theta.\right]$ 'to fulfil the word of God;' i. e. 'to perform my office in preaching unrestrictedly, to give all its full scope to the word of God:' infin. of design (see notes on ver. 22) dependent either on रेंs '̇ $\gamma \in \nu$ ó $\mu \eta \nu$ (Huth.), or perhaps more naturally on $\tau \grave{\nu} \nu$ סonceioav к. $\tau$. $\lambda$., thus giving an amplification to the preceding eis vipas. The glosses on $\pi \lambda \eta \rho \omega \hat{\sigma} \alpha \iota$ are exceedingly numerous ; the most probable seem, (a) 'ad plene exponendam totam salutis doctrinam,' Daven. 1, compare Olsh., and Tholuck, Bergpr. p. 136 ; ( ( ) 'to spread abroad,' Huth., - who compares Acts v. 28 ; (c) ' to give its fullest amplitude to, to fill up the measures of its fore-ordained universality,' not perhaps without some allusion to the oikovouía which would thus be fully discharged; compare Rom. xv.
 eủaryé̀iov toû $\mathrm{X} \rho$. Of these (b) has an advantage over (a) in implying a $\pi \lambda$ ท́pwots viewed extensively, in having, in fact, a quantitative rather than a qualitative reference, but fails in exhausting the meaning and completely satisfying the context ; (c) by carrying out the idea further, and pointing to the $\lambda$ óros as something which was to have a universal application, and not be confined to a single nation (hence the introduction of cis $\dot{v} \mu \mathrm{a} s$ ), seems most in accordance with the spirit of the passage and with the words that follow; compare the somewhat analogous expression, \& $\lambda$ óyos tov̂



 hardly be added that the $\lambda$ óros $\tau 0 \hat{v} \Theta \in o \hat{v}$ does not imply the 'promissiones Dei, partim de Christo in genere, partim de vocatione Gentium,' Beza, but simply
 xiv. 36, 2 Corinth. ii. 17, 1 Thessal. ii. 13, al.
26. $\tau \delta \mu \nu \sigma \tau$ भ́pıov $\tau \delta$ ふ่ $\pi$ ок.] 'the mystery which hath been hidden;' apposition to the preceding $\tau \partial \nu \lambda o ́ \gamma o \nu \tau o \hat{v}$ ©єoû. The $\mu \nu \sigma \tau \eta \eta^{\prime}$ ov was the divine purpose of salvation in Christ, and, more especially, as the context seems to show, 'de saivandis Gentibus per gratiam evangelicam,' Daven. ; see Ephes. iii. 4 sq., and compare Eph. i. 9. On the meanings of $\mu \nu \sigma$ тinplov in the N . T., see notes on Eph. v. 32, and Reuss, Theol. Chret. IV. 9, Vol. II. p. 88, where the applications of the term in the N. T. are briefly elucidated.
$\vec{\alpha} \pi \dot{\partial} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ aiढ้ $\omega \nu$ к. $\tau . \lambda_{\text {.] }}$ 'from the ages and from the generations (that have passed) ;' from the long temporal periods (aî̀ $\omega \in s$ ) and the successive generations that made them up ( $\gamma \in \nu \in a l$; see on $E p h$. iii. 21), which have elapsed (observe the article) since the 'arcanum decretum ' was concealed. The expression is not identical with $\pi \rho \rho \delta \hat{\omega} \nu \alpha i \omega \nu \omega \nu, 1$ Cor. ii. 7 ; the counsel was formed $\pi \rho \delta \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ ai$\omega \nu \omega \nu$, but concealed $\mathfrak{\alpha} \pi \delta \tau^{\pi} \omega \nu$ aí $\omega \nu \omega \nu$; comp. Rom. xvi. 25, and see notes on Eph. iii. 9, where the same expression occurs.
 been made manifest ;' transition from the participial to the finite construct., sug. gested by the importance of the predication; see notes on Eph. i. 20, and Winer, $G r$. § 63. 2. b, p. 505 sq., where other examples are noticed and discussed. The фavé $\rho \omega \sigma \iota s$, the actual and historical manifestation (De W.), took place, as

Meyer observes, in different ways, partly by revelation (Ephes. iii. 5), partly by preaching (ch. iv. 4, Tit. i. 3) and exposition (Rom. xvi. 26), and partly by all combined. On the connection of vyvl [Lachm. עv̂v, with BCFG; mss. ; Did.] with the aor., see notes on ver. 21, and for a good distinction between $\nu \bar{\nu} \nu(\bar{\varepsilon} \pi l$ $\tau \bar{\omega} \nu \quad \tau \rho \stackrel{\omega}{\nu} \nu \quad \chi \rho o ́ v \omega \nu)$ and $\nu v \nu\{(\xi \pi i \imath \mu o ́ v o v$ '่ $\nu \in \sigma \tau \omega \bar{\omega} о s$ ), see Ammonius, Voc. Diff. p. 99, ed. Valck. tois áriobs aủoô] To limit these words to the apostles, from a comparison with Eph. iii. 5 (Steiger, Olsh. : FG; Boern. actlally insert $\dot{\alpha} \pi 0 \tau \tau \delta \lambda o 1 s)$, or to the elect, 'quos Deus in Christo consecrandos decrevit' (Daven. 1), is highly unsatisfactory; and quite contrary to St. Paul's regular and unrestricted use of the word; so Theod., who, however, shows that he remembered Eph. iii. 5, тoîs àrootó ${ }^{2} o t s$, каl тoîs ठıà тоút $\omega \nu$ л $\pi \in \pi เ \sigma \tau \epsilon \cup \kappa o ́ \sigma l . ~ O n ~$ the meaning of áplos, see notes on ver. 2, and on Eph. i. 1.
 God did will ;' i. e. 'seeing that to them it was God's will,' etc., the relative having probably here, as in ver. 25 , an indirectly causal, or explanatory force ('rationem adjungit,' Daven.), and reiterating the subject to introduce more readily the specific purpose $\gamma \nu \omega$ píal $\kappa . \tau . \lambda$. which was contemplated by God in the фavépwors. The most recent commentators, Meyer, Eadie, Alf., rightly reject any reference of $\grave{\eta}^{\prime} \boldsymbol{\vartheta} \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \eta \sigma \in \nu$ to the free grace of God (Eph. i. 9, кarà т خìv єủסoкíav aùrov̂), no such idea being here involved in the context: what $\grave{\eta} \grave{\prime} \in \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \eta \sigma \in \nu$ here implies is, not on the one hand, that God 'was pleased' (' propensionem voluntatis indicat,' Est.), nor on the other, that He 'was willing,' Hammond, but simply and plainly 'it was God's will'

## 

to do so. On the distinction between शง่́̀ $\omega$ and Boviдoual, see notes on 1 Tim. v. 14.
$\gamma \nu \omega \rho\{\sigma \alpha$,$] 'to make$ known;' practically little different from $\phi \alpha \nu \epsilon \rho \hat{\omega} \sigma \alpha$. . The latter perhaps is, slightly more restricted, as involving the idea of a previous concealment (see above and compare $2 \mathrm{Tim} . \mathrm{i} .10$ ), the former more general and unlimited: see Meyer
 n. r. $\lambda$.] ' what is the riches of the glory of this mystery:' not, exactly, 'how great,' Mey., but with the simple force of $\tau i s$, . what,' referring alike to nature and degree; compare Eph. i. 18, and see notes in loc. The gen. $\tau \hat{\eta} s \delta \delta \xi \bar{n}$ is no mere genitive of quality which may be resolved into an adjective, and appended either to $\pi$ गoûtos (' herrliche Reichthum,' Luth.) or to $\mu v \sigma \tau$ hipiov ('gloriosi hujus mysterii,' Beza), but, as always in these kinds of accumulated genitives in St. Paul, specially denotes that peculiar attribute of the $\mu \nu \sigma \tau$ n̂plov (gen. subjecti) which more particularly evinces the $\pi \lambda o u ̂$ îcos ; see notes and reff. on Eph. i. 6, and compare Eph. i. 18. The $\delta \delta \xi \xi a$ itself is not to be limited to the transforming nature of the mystery of the Gospel, in its effects on men ( $\delta \grave{\iota} \psi \downarrow \lambda \lambda \omega \hat{\nu}$ р $\eta \mu \alpha \alpha^{\prime} \omega \nu \nu$ кal $\pi$ п $\sigma \tau \epsilon \omega \mathrm{s} \mu \dot{0} \eta \eta s$, Chrys.), nor yet, on the objective side, to the $\delta \delta \dot{\xi} \alpha \sim$ тov̂ $\Theta \in o \hat{v}$, the grace, glory, and attributes of God which are revealed by it, - but, as the weight of the enunciation requires, to both (see especially De W.), perhaps more particularly to the latter. To make its reference identical with that of the $\delta \delta \xi \alpha a$ below (Mey., Alf.), where the preceding words introduce $a$ new shade of thought, does not seem so exegetically satisfactory. The former $\delta \delta \xi a$ gains from its collocation a more general and abstract force; the latter, from its association with ${ }^{2} \lambda \pi i s$, has a more specific reference.

tiles ;' semilocal clause appended to $\tau i$
 sphere in which the $\pi \lambda$ गoùros $\tau \hat{\eta} s \delta \delta \xi$. тồ $\mu v \sigma \tau$. is more especially evinced;

 Chrys. ; see especially Eph. i. 18, where the construction is exactly similar.
Is दं $\sigma \tau \iota \mathrm{X} \rho$.] The reading is here somewhat doubtful ; oेs is found in CD ERL ; nearly all mss. ; Chrys., Theod. (Tisch., Rec.), and, as being the more difficult reading, is to be preferred to 8 , adopted by Lachm. with ABFG; 17. 67 **, and perhaps Vulg., al. But to what does it refer? Three interpretations have been suggested: $(a)$ the complex idea of the entire clause, - Christ in his relation to the Gentile world, De Wette, Eadie ; (b) the more remote $\tau \delta$ $\pi$ रoûtos к. $\boldsymbol{\tau}$. $\lambda$., ©Ecum., Daven., Mcy.; (c) the more immediately preceding $\mu \nu \sigma$ тпрiou toúrov, Chrys., Alf., al. Of these (a) is defensible (comp. Phil. i. 28), but too vague; (b) is plausible (compare Eph. iii. 8), but rests mainly on the assumption that $\pi \lambda$ oûros is the leading word (Mey., Winer), whereas it seems clear from ver. 26 , that $\mu \nu \sigma \tau \eta^{\prime} p$. is the really important word in the sentence. We retain then the usunl reference to $\mu \nu \sigma \tau \eta \dot{p}$ ov ; Christ who was preached, and was working by grace among them, was in Himself the true and real mystery of redemption ; compare notes on Eph. iii. 5. In any case the masc: oेs results from a simple attraction to the predicate; see Winer, Gr. § 24. 3, p. 150.
हं $\nu \quad \hat{v} \mu \hat{\imath} \nu]$ ' among you ;' not exclusively ' in vobis inhabitans per fidem,' Zanch. (compare Eph. iii. 17), but in parallel-
 however, this parallelism is not perfectly exact (Alf.), - for $\mathrm{e}_{\nu} \dot{\delta} \mu \mathrm{i} \nu$ is in close association with the preceding substantive,

admit that 'in you' is also virtually and by consequence involved in the present use of the preposition ; compare Olsh., Eadie. The connection adopted by Syr.
 involves an unnecessary and untenable trajection.
$\dot{\eta} \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \pi i_{s} \tau \hat{\eta} S$ $\delta \delta \xi \eta s$ ] 'the hope of glory;' apposition to the preceding Xpıбт̀ेs èv $\dot{u} \mu \hat{\nu}$; not either the 'spei causa' (Grot.), or the object of it (Vorst), but its very element and substance ; see 1 Tim. i. 1 , and notes in loc. The second gloss of Theoph, $\dot{\eta}$
 rect; $\delta \delta \xi a$ is a pure substantive, and refers to the future glory and blessedness in heaven, Rom. v. 2, 1 Corin. ii. 7 (apparently), 2 Cor. iv. 17, al. For a list of the varions words with which è $\lambda \pi i$ is is thus joined, see Reuss, Theol. Chret. Iv. 20, Vol. II. p. 221.
28. ò $\nu \dot{\eta} \mu \in \hat{\imath} s \kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \gamma \gamma$.] 'whom we preach;' whom I and Timothy, with other like-minded teachers (comp. Steiger), do solemnly preach; the $\hat{\eta} \mu \mathrm{eis}$ being emplatic, and instituting a contrast between the accredited and the non-accredited preachers of the Gospel. On the intensive, surely not local (ăvà̂ev
 see notes on Phit. i. 17.
$\nu$ ०uЭ $\in \tau \circ$ ồ $\nu \tau \in$ s] 'admonishing,' 'warning,' ' corripientes,' Vulg., IEth. ; participial clause defining more nearly the manner or accompaniments of the катаү$\gamma \in \lambda$ र́a. The verb vovicteiv has its proper force and meaning of 'admonishing with blame' (עoviєturol $\lambda$ d́rot, Xenoph. Mem. 1. 2. 21, compare notes on Eph. vi. 4), and, as Meyer (compare De W.) rightly observes, points to the $\mu$ eravoeite of the evangelical message, while $\delta \delta \delta d \sigma \kappa$. lays
the foundation for the $\pi เ \sigma \tau \epsilon \dot{\varepsilon} \epsilon \tau \epsilon$; so, in-

 On the meaning of $\nu 0 v \vartheta \epsilon \tau \in \mathrm{iv}$, which implies, primarily, correction by word, an appeal to the עoîs (compare 1 Sam . iii. 12), and derivatively, correction by act, Judges viii. 16 (compare Plato, Leg. Ix. p. 879), see Trench, Synon. § 32.
$\pi \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \alpha \nless \not \subset \nu P \rho$.] Thrice repeated and emphatic ; apparently not without allusion to the exclusiveness and Judaistic bias of the false teachers at Colossx. The message was universal; it was addressed to every one, whether in every case it might be received or no: $\tau \ell \lambda \hat{\epsilon}^{-}$

 $\dot{\eta} \mu \mathrm{a} s$, Theoph. $\quad \dot{\epsilon} \nu \pi d \sigma \boldsymbol{\eta}$ $\sigma \circ \phi[a]$ ' in all, i.e. in every form of, wisdom ;' see notes on Eph. i. 8: mode in which the $\delta$ odod $\sigma \in \omega$ was carried out, $\mu \epsilon \tau \grave{\alpha}$ «d́cŋŋs $\sigma o \phi i a s$, Chrys. (comparo ch. iii. 16), or perhaps, more precisely, the characteristic element in which the $\delta \delta \delta \alpha-$ $\chi^{7}$ ㄱ was always to be, and to which it was to be circumseribed. The meaning is thus really the same, but the manner in which it is expressed slightly different. The lines of demareation between sphere of action (Epll. iv. 17), accordance with (Ephes. iv. 16), and characterizing feature (Eph. vi. 2), all more or less involving some notion of modality, are not alvays distinctly recognizable. The influence of the Aramaic $\boldsymbol{\Delta}$ in the various usages of $\dot{e} \nu$ in the N . T. is by no means inconsiderable.

I $\nu \alpha \pi \alpha \rho \alpha-$ $\sigma \tau \dot{n} \sigma \omega \mu \in \nu]$ ' in order that we may pre. sent,' exactly as in ver. 22 , with implied reference, not to a sacrifice, but to the final appearance of every man before God: 'en metam et scopum Pauli, atque
 èvéprєtav aùtov̂ tخ̀̀ èveprov
adeo omnium verbi ministrorum，＇Dave－ nant，－whose remarks on the propriety of the intention，－as coming from one who sat at the Council of Dort，－are not undeserving of perusal．The con－ cluding words $\epsilon \nu$ X $\rho$ ．，as usual，define the sphere in which the $\tau \in \lambda \epsilon เ 6$＇tทs，＇l＇en－ semble de toutes les qualités naturclles au Chrétien＇（Reuss，Theol．Chret．Vol． iI．p．182），is to consist ；compare notes on ch．iv．12，and on Eph．iv．13．The polemical antithesis which Chrys，here
 to the continual recurrence of ${ }^{2} \nu \mathrm{X} \rho$ ．，is perhaps more tnan doubtful．The addi－ tion of＇I $\eta \sigma o \hat{v}$ is rightly rejected by Tisch． with ABCD FG ；mss．；Claromanus； Clem．，and Lat．Ff．

29．$\epsilon$ is 8］＇to which end ；＇the prep． iwith its usual and proper force denoting the object contemplated in the котเâע； compare notes on Gal．ii． 8.
кal котเิ］＇I also toil；＇＇beside preaching with $\nu 0 v, \uparrow \epsilon \sigma i a$ and $\delta เ \delta \alpha \chi \eta$ ，I also sustain every form of кótos（2 Cor． vi．5）in the cause of the Gospel，＇the kal contrasting（see notes on Phil．iv．12） the котเิे with the previous кaтay． $\kappa . \tau . \lambda$ ．The relapse into the first per－ son has an individualizing force，and carries on the reader from the general and common labors of preaching the
 gles of the individual preacher．On the meaning and derivation of котt⿳⿵人一⿲丶丶㇒一⿱⿰㇒一乂心，see notes on 1 Tim．iv． 10.
$\dot{\alpha} \gamma \omega \nu \iota \zeta 6 \mu \in \nu 0 s]$＇striving；＇compare chap．iv．12， 1 Tim．iv． 10 （Lachm．，－a doubtful reading，vi．12）， 2 Tim．iv．7， and in a more special sense， 1 Cor．ix． 25．It is doubtful whether this is to be referred to an outward，or an inward $\alpha \quad \alpha \gamma \nu$ ．The former is adopted by Chrys．， Theoph．，Davanant，al．；the latter by

Steig．，Olsh．，and most modern com－ mentators．The use of котьิ（sec on Tim．l．c．）perhaps may seem to point to the older interpretation；the immediate context（ch．ii．1），however，and the use
 ả $\gamma \omega \nu \nu \zeta \delta \mu \epsilon \nu 0 s$ र́mè $\rho$ v́ $\mu \bar{\omega} \nu$ èv raîs $\pi \rho 0 \sigma \epsilon \nu-$ $\chi$ ais）seem here rather more in favor of modern exegesis，unless indeed with Ceum．and De Wette we may not im－ probably admit both．
кarà rウ̀ $\nu$＇̇ע $\frac{1}{\rho} \gamma$ ．］＇according to His worling which worketh in me；＇measure of the apostle＇s spiritual кóros（compare notes on Eph．i．19），viz．not his own ėvépyeia but，as the coutext seems to suggest，that of Christ ；$\tau \delta \nu$ aủtô̂ кóто⿱
 who alone of the Greck commentators （Theod．silet）expressly refers the aủroû to Christ，the others apparently referring it to $\delta \Theta$ €ós．On the construction of the verb $\grave{\nu} \nu \in \rho \gamma$ ．，see notes on Gal．ii．8，v．6， and on its meaning，notes on Phil．ii． 13. The passive interpretation＇quæ agitur， exercetur，perficitur＇（Bull，Exam．Cens． II．3），though lexically defensible，seems certainly at variance with St．Paul＇s reg－ ular use of the verb；see on Phil．l．c．
$\epsilon \in \nu \delta v \nu a ́ \mu \in \ell]$＇in power，＇i．e．power－ fully；modal adjunct to $\bar{\epsilon} \nu \in \rho \gamma o v \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \eta \nu$ ． Though it seems arbitrary to restrict Sóvaus to miraculous gifts（Michael．），it still seems equally so（with Meyer and Alf．）summarily to exclude it ；compare Gal．iii．5．The principal reference，as the singular suggests（contrast Rom．i． 4 and Acts ii．22），seems certainly to in－ ward operations；a secondary reference to outward manifestations of power seems，however，fairly admissible ；＇quum res postulat，etiam miraculis，＇Calvin， compare Olsh．in loc．

I am earnestly striving for you，that you may come to
 the full knowledge of Christ．Let no one deceive you，but as you received Christ，walk in Him．

Chapter II．1．$\gamma$ áp］Description of the nature and objects of the struggle previously alluded to，introduced by the زàp argumentative（not transitional，$\rightleftharpoons$ ？ Syr．［probably not a different reading， see Schaaf，Lex．s．v．］，and partially even Alf．），which confirms and illustrates，－ not merely the foregoing word à $\gamma \omega \nu \iota \zeta \delta-$ $\mu \in \nu 0 s$（Beng．），but the whole current of the verse：＇meminerat in calce superio－ ris capitis suorum laborum et certami－ num，corum nunc causam et materiam explicat，＇Just．ìخíкоу $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \hat{\omega} \nu a]$＇how great a struggle；＇not ＇solicitudinem，＇Vulg．，but＇certamen，＇
Clarom．， Hè $\left.^{\circ}\right|_{\Delta}$ Syr．，＇quantum col－ luctor，＇止th．The struggle，as the cir－ cumstances of the apostle＇s captivity suggest，was primarily inward，－＇in－ tense and painful anxicty，＇Eadic（com－ pare ch．iv．12），yet not perhaps wholly without reference to the outward suffer－ ings which he was enduring for them （ch．i．24），and for all his converts． The qualitative adj．$\grave{\eta} \lambda i ́ k o s$（Hesychius тотатós，$\mu$ é रas，óroîos；compare Don－ aldson，Cratyl．§ 254），occurs only here and James iii． 5 ．$\pi \in \rho$ l $\dot{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu]$＇for you．＇The reading is some－ what doubtful．Lachm．reads $\dot{v} \pi \grave{\rho} \rho$ with $\mathrm{ABCD}^{2} ; 6 \mathrm{mss}$ ．；but as this might ea－ sily have come from ch．iv． 12 （compare ch．i．24），it seems best with Tisch．to retain $\pi \epsilon \rho!$ ，which is found in $\mathrm{D}^{1} \mathrm{D}^{3} \mathrm{EFG}$ $\mathrm{KK}_{2}$ ，and the great majority of mss．： these prepositions are often interchanged． On the distinction between them，see on Gal．i．4，and on Phil．i． 7.
кal $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ ढ่ $\nu$ ムaoठ．］The Christians in the neighboring city of Laodicea are men－ tioned with them，as possibly subjected to the same evil influences of heretical teaching．The rich（Rev．iii．17），com－
mercial（compare Cicero，Epist．Fam． III．5），city of Laodicea，formerly called Diospolis，afterwards Rhoas，and subse－ quently Laodicea，in honor of Laodice， wife of Antiochus II．，was situated on the river Lycus，about eighteen English miles to the west of Colossx，and about six miles south of Hierapolis，which lat－ ter city is not improbably hinted at in， каl ठ̈боь к．т．$\lambda$ ．；see Wieseler，Chronol． p． 441 note．Close upon the probable date of this Epistle（A．D． 61 or 62），the city suffered severely from an earth－ quake，but was restored without any as－ sistance from Rome；Tacit．Ann．xiv． 27，compare Strabo，Geogr．XII．8． 16 （ed．Kramer）：a place bearing the name of Eski－hissar is supposed to mark the site of this once important city．For further notices of Laodicea seo Winer， RWB．s．v．Vol．II．p．5，Pauly，Real－ Encycl．Vol．xv．1，p．764，and Arundell， Seven Churches，p． 84 sq．，ib．Asia Minor， Vol．II．p． 180 sq．

каl $\delta$ бot к．т．入．］＇and（in a word）as many as， etc．；＇the kal probably annexing the general to the special（compare Matth． xxvi．59，notes on Eph．i．21，Phil．iv． 12，and Winer，Gr．§ 53．3，p．388），and including，with perhaps a thought of $\mathrm{Hi}-$ erapolis（see above），all in those parts who had not seen the apostle．The or－ dinary principles of grammatical perspi－ cuity seem distinctly to imply that the ípeis and the oi $̇ \nu \Lambda \alpha o \delta$ ．belong to the general class кal 8 бo九 к．т．$\lambda$ ．，and con－ sequently that the Colossians were not personally acquainted with the apostle． Recent attempts have been mado either to refer the örot to a third and different set of persons to the Colossians and La－ odiceans（Schulz．Stud．u．Krit．1829，p． 538 ；so Theodoret and a schol．in Mat－ thei，p．168），or to a portion only of those two Churches（Wiggers，Stud．u．




Krit. 1838, p. 176), but as all the words are, in fact, under the vinculum of a common proposition, and as aủr $\omega$, if dissociated from $\dot{\nu} \mu \omega \bar{\nu}$ кal $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \in ̇ \nu \bigwedge \alpha o \delta$. (comp. Schulz), would leave the mention of these two former classes most aimless and unnatural, we seem justified in concluding with nearly all modern editors that the Colossians and those of Laodicea had not seen the apostle in the flesh; see the good note of Wieseler, Chronol. p. 440 sq., and Neander, Planting, Vol. I. p. 171 (Bohn).

The form éćpakav adopted by Lachm., Tisch. [with ABC (Eop.) $\mathrm{D}^{1}$ ], is decidedly Alexandrian (see Wincr, (̛̌r. § 13. 2, p. 71), and probably the true reading. The 'sonstige Gcbrauch Pauli ' urged against it by Meyer is imaginary, as the third person plur. does not elsewhere occur in St. Paul's Epistles.
év баркl seems naturally connected with the preceding $\pi \rho \delta \delta \sigma \pi \delta \delta \nu \mu o u$ (Vulg., Coptic, Æth.), not with ėढ́pakà (Syr., but not Philox., where the order is changed), forming with it one single idea. There is almost obviously here no implied an-

 oph., compare ver. 5): the bodily countenance is not in opposition with 'the spiritual physiognomy,' Olsh., but seems a concrete touch added to enhance the nature of his struggle ; it was not for those whom he personally knew and who personally knew him, but for those for whom his interest was purely spiritual and ministerial.
2. I $\nu \propto \pi \alpha \rho \alpha \kappa \lambda$.] 'in order that their hearts may be comforted;' not 'may be strengthened,' 'inveniant robur,' Copt. [literally, but? if the derivative meaning 'consol. accipere' is not the most common, e. g. Psalm cxix. 52], De W., Alf.,
al., - but 'consolentur' (consolationem
 accipiant], Syr., 'gaudeant,', Jth., the fuller meaning which, in passages of this nature, жapak. always appears to bear in St. Paul's Epistles, and from which there does not here seem sufficient reason to depart (contr. Bisp., Alford) : surely those exposed to the sad trial of erroneous teachings needed consolation; compare Davenant in loc. For cxample of таракал. compare ch. iv. 8, Eph. vi. 22 , and even 2 Thess. ii. 17 , where the associated $\sigma \tau \eta \rho\{\xi \alpha \iota$ is not a repetition, but an amplification, of the preceding таракалє́ $\sigma a t$. The final 'lva is obviously dependent on ả $\gamma \omega \hat{\nu} a$ モ̌ $\chi \omega$ (comp. Chrys.
 the aim of the struggle, - the consolation and spiritual union of those believers previously mentioned who had not seen the apostle in the flesh.
 ing lnit together in love :' relapse to the logical subject by the common participial anacoluthon (Eph. iv. 2 ; see notes on Eph. i. 18, and on Phil. i. 30), the participle having its modal force, and defining the manner whercby, and circumstances under which, the тарák $\lambda \eta \sigma$ ts was to take place; see Madvig, Synt. § 176. b. The verb $\sigma \nu \mu \beta \iota \beta$. has not here its derivative sense, 'instructi,' Vulg., Copt., but its primary meaning of aggregation, 'knit together,' Auth. (comp. Syr.
 metur'), as in ch. ii. 19, and Eph. iv. 16, where see notes. The reading -év $\omega \omega \nu$ (Rec., with $\mathrm{D}^{3} \mathrm{E}^{2} \mathrm{KL}$; al.) seems certainly only a grammatical emendation.
' $\mathrm{E} \nu$ ád $\alpha$ ' $\pi \eta$, with the usual meaning of the preposition, denotes not the instru-

## 

ment ('per caritatem,' Est.), but the sphere and element in which they were to be knit together, and is associated by means of the copulative kal (not 'etiam,' Beng.) with eis $\pi \hat{\alpha} \nu \kappa . \tau . \lambda$. which defines the object of the union; see next note. $\epsilon$ is $\pi \hat{\alpha} \nu \tau \delta \pi \lambda o \hat{v} \tau o s$ ] 'unto all the richness $;$ ' prepositional member defining the object and purpose contemplated in the $\sigma \nu \mu \beta i \beta \alpha \sigma t s$, and closely connected with the preceding definition of the ethical sphere of the action; deep insight into the mystery of God is the object of the union in love. The connection with $\pi \alpha_{-}$ par $\lambda \eta$ ๆ, (Baumg.-Crus.) mars the union of the prepositional members, and gains nothing in exegesis. The reading $\pi \alpha, \nu \tau \alpha$ $\pi \lambda o y ิ \tau v \nu$, though fairly supported (Rec. with DEKL), seems clearly to have had a paradiplomatic origin (see Pref. to Gal. p. xVII), the TA being a clerical crror for TO, and $\pi$ गoûtov a corresponding correction. On this neuter form, see notes on Eph. i. 7 ;
$\tau \hat{\eta} s \pi \lambda \eta \rho \circ \phi \circ \rho\{\alpha s, \tau \hat{\eta} s \quad \sigma v \nu \epsilon \in \sigma$.] ' of the full assurance of the understanding;' not 'certo persuasæ intelligentix,' Davenant, a resolution of the gen. which is wholly unnecessary: compare notes on ch. i. 27. The word $\pi \lambda \eta \rho \circ \phi$. (1 Thess. i. 5 , Heb. vi. 11, x. 22) denotes on the qualitative side ( $\pi \lambda 0 \hat{\tau} \tau$., quantitative, De W.) the completeness of the persuasion which was to be associated with the $\sigma \dot{v} \in \sigma t s$, - which the $\sigma \dot{v} \nu \in \sigma t s$ was to liave and to involve (gen. possess.), -and, as Olsh. observes, may denote that the $\sigma v^{\prime}$ veबts was not to be merely outward, dependent on the intellect, but inward, resting on the testimony of the Spirit; compare Clem.-Rom. I. Cor. $\$ 42$. On the meaning of $\sigma u{ }^{\nu} \in \sigma t s$, see notes on ch. i. 9 : that it is here Christian ouveots, clearly results from the context (Mey.). $\epsilon$ is $\epsilon \pi\left\{\gamma \nu \omega \sigma \iota \nu \cdot \kappa . \tau . \lambda_{0}\right.$ \} 'unto the full knowledge of the mystery of God, even

Christ ;' prepositional member exactly parallel to the preceding $\epsilon$ is $\pi \hat{a} \nu \tau \delta े \pi \lambda$. к. $\tau, \lambda$. The construction of the last three words is somewhat doubtful. Three connections present themselves; (a) 'the mystery of the God of Christ,' Huth., Mey., Xpıotoû being the possessive gen. of relationship, etc. ; see Scheuerl. Synt. § 16. 7, p. 123 sq., and comp. Eph. i. 17, and notes in loc.; ( $\beta$ ) 'the mystery of God, even of Christ, $\mathrm{X} \rho$. being a gen. in simple apposition to, and more exactly defining $\Theta_{\epsilon o v ̂}$; so in effect, Hil., 'Deus Christus sacramentum est;' $(\gamma)$ 'the mysiery of God, even Christ:' X $\rho$. being in apposition, not to $\Theta \epsilon \circ \hat{v}$, but to $\mu \nu \sigma \tau \eta$ plov, and so forming a very close parallel to ch. i. 27. Of these ( $\alpha$ ) seems hopelessly hard and artificial; $(\beta)$ though dogmatically true, seems here an unnecessary specification, and exegetically considered, much inferior to $(\gamma)$, which stands in harmony with the preceding expression $\mu \nu \sigma \tau \eta p i o v$ ôs é évt X $\operatorname{Xi\sigma t}$ os (ch i. 27), and has the indirect support of D1, Clarom., Aug., Vig., and Fith., $z a-$ baenta Chireslos [quod de Christo]. It seems singular that these words have not given rise to more discussion (South has a doctrinal sermon on the text, Vol. ii. p. 174 sq.; but docs not notice the readings), for $(\beta)$, though in point of collocation somewhat doubtful, seems still, considered apart from the context, not indefensible, and at any rate is not to be disposed of by Meyer's summary 'entbehrt aller Paulinischen analogie.' We adopt $(\gamma)$, however, on what seem decided exegetical grounds. On the meaning and applications of $\mu \nu \sigma \tau \eta^{-}$ prov, see notes on Ephes. v. 32, Reuss, Theol. Chret. Iv. 9, Vol. II. p. 89; and for the exact force of $\epsilon \pi\{\gamma \nu \omega \sigma$ 's ('accurata cognitio') here apparently confirmed by the juxtaposition of the simple $\gamma \nu \omega \bar{\sigma} t s$, ver. 3, see notes on Eph. i. 17.

## 

2. $\tau 0 \hat{u}$ Gєoû X pıб $\sigma \hat{v}$ ] This passage deserves our attentive consideration. The reading of the text is that of B, Hil. (Lach., Tisch. ed. 1, Mey., Huth., Wordsw.), and has every appearance of being the original reading, and that from which the many perplexing variations have arisen. The other principal readings are (a) qoû ©єoû, with cursive mss. 37. 67米. 71. 80*. 116 (Griesb., Scholz, Tisch. ed. 2, 7), followed by Olsh., De W., Alf., and the majority of modern commentators: (b) tuṽ

 $\dot{x} \rho$. with D"EKL ; many mss. and Vv.; Theod., Dam., al. (Rec.). Now of these (a) is undoubtedly too weakly supported ; (b) seems rery like a gloss of the assumed true reading tov̂ $\Theta \in o \hat{v} \mathrm{X} p$. ; (c) and (d) still more expanded or explanatory readings. As all four may be so simply derived from the text, $(a)$ by omission, the rest by gloss and expansion, we adopt, with considerable confidence, the reading of Lachm., and we bclieve also, of Tregelles.
 explaining the predication involved in the preceding apposition ( $\mu v \sigma \tau \eta \rho$. $=$ Xpıбтov̂), the relative having its explanatory force ; see notes on ch, i. 25. To follow the reading of the text, and yet to refer $\epsilon \nu \Psi$ to the $\mu \nu \sigma \tau \eta$ pion (Mey.), seems unusually perplexed, unless (with Mey.) we adopt the unsatisfactory construction (a), previously discussed. De Wette and Mey, urge the implied antithesis between $\mu \nu \sigma \tau$. and à áóкр., but to this it may be said, - first, that what is applicable to $\mu \nu \sigma \tau$. is equally so to that to which it is equivalent (comp. Bisp.) ; secondly, that the secondary predicate àто́крифон (see below) logically elucidates the equivalence of Xpıatds with the $\mu \nu \sigma \tau \dot{\eta} \rho t o \nu$, but would seem otiose if only added to enhance the nature of the
 pare Waterl. Christ's Div. Serm. Vir. Vol.II. p. 156. $\quad \in i \sigma i \nu \pi \alpha ́ \nu \tau \in S$ к. $\tau . \lambda$.] 'are all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge hidden;' not 'the secret treasures, etc.,' Meyer, Alf., which obscures the secondary predication of manner, and in fact confounds it with the usual 'attributive' construction (Krüg., Sprachl. §50.8). The position of the substantive verb and the order of the
words seem to show that ảnóкрифои is not to be joined with eiolv as a direct predication (Syr., Copt., De W., al.), but that it is subjoined to it (Vulgate, Ath.) as the predication of manner, and is in fact equivalent to an adverb, the most distinct type of the secondary predicate; see especially Donaldson, Cratyl. § 304, and comp. Müller, Kleine Schrift. Vol. I. p. 310 (Donalds.), who has the credit of first introducing this necessary distinction betrreen 'adjectiva attributa, prodicata, and apposita;' see also Donaldson, $G r$. $\$ 436-447$. It will be seen that the translation of Meyer and Alf., and especially the explanations based upon it, are unsatisfactory from not having observed these important distinctions. Exegetically considered, the expression seems to convey that all treasures of wisdom and knowledge are in Christ, and are hiddenly so, 'quo verbo innuitur, quod pretiosum et magnificum est in Christo non prominere, aut protinus in oculos incurrere hominum carnalium, sed ita latere ut conspiciatur tantummodo ab illis quibus Deus oculos dedit aquilinos, id est, spirituales ad vivendum,' Davenant ; $\not \omega \sigma \tau \epsilon$ $\pi \alpha p^{\prime}$ aỉrov̂ $\delta \in i ̂ \pi \alpha ́ \nu \tau \alpha a i \tau \epsilon i ̂ v$, Chrysostom. There is thus no need with Bähr and


others to modify the simple meaning of the adjective. $\sigma o \phi$ las $\kappa a l \gamma \nu \omega \sigma \in \omega s]$ The exact distinetion between these words is not perhaps very easy to substantiate. We can hardly say that ' $\sigma o \phi i \alpha$ res credendas, $\gamma \nu \hat{\omega} \sigma t s$ res agendas complectitur' (Davenant), but rather the contrary. It would seem, as in roфía and $\phi p \partial{ }^{2} \eta \sigma$ ots (see notes on Eph. i. 9), that oopia is the more general, 'wisdom,' in its completest sense, kotvês
 restricted and special, 'knowledge,' as contrasted with the results and applications of it ; see Neander, Planting, Vol. I. p. 139 (Bohn), Delitzsch, Bibl. Psychol. 1v. 7, p. 166, and, on the meaning of ' 'wisdom,' comp. Taylor (H.), Notes from Life, p. 95 .
3. Tô̂to ס六 $\lambda \epsilon \in \gamma \omega]$ ' Now this $I$ say; ' transition, by means of the $\delta \grave{\varepsilon} \mu \mathrm{E}$ таßaтıкóv (Hartung, Partik. Vol. I. p. 165; omitted by Lachm. with $\mathrm{A}^{1}$ (apparently), B ; Ambrosiast.), to the warnings which, with some intermixture of exhortation and doctrinal statements, pervade the chapter. The тoùro seems clearly to refer not merely to ver. 3 , but to the whole introductory paragraph, ver. 1-3. $\quad \pi \alpha \rho \alpha \lambda \circ \gamma\{\lceil\eta \tau \alpha$, ] 'may deceive;' only here and James i. 22 , though not uncommon in the LXX, e. g. Josh. ix. 22, 1 Sam. xii. 28 , 2 Sam. xxi. $5, \mathrm{al}$. The verb $\pi$ apa $\lambda 0 \gamma$. is of common oceurrence in later Greek, and properly denotes 'to deceive,' either by false reckoning (Demosth. Aphob. r. p. 822), or false reasoning (Isocr. p. 420 c), and thence generally, àmarâv, $\psi$ ev́$\sigma a \sigma$ oul (Hesych.) ; comp. Arrian, Epict.
 rat, and examples in Elsner, Obs. Vol. II. p. 261, Loesn. Obs. p. 335.
 speech ;' compare 1 Cor. ii. 4 , èv $\pi \in i$ ìoîs
 species of instrumental force in which the object is conceived as existing in the means ; comp. Jelf, Gr. $\$ 622.3$. The subst. occurs in Plato, Thecet. p. 162 e; and the verb in Aristot. Eth. Nic. I. 1, but with a more special and teclnical reference to probability as opposed to demonstration or to mathematical certainty.
4. $\epsilon i$ خàp kal к. т. ג.] 'for if Iam absent verily in the flesh;' reason for the foregoing warning, founded on the fact of his spiritual presence with them ; $\epsilon \boldsymbol{i}$
 тò̀s à $\pi a t \epsilon \omega ิ \nu a s$, Chrys. The ral does not belong, strictly considered, to the $\epsilon i$ (compare Raphel in loc.), but to $\sigma a p k i$, on which it throws a slight emplasis, contrasting it with the following $\pi \nu \in \dot{\operatorname{u}} \mu \mathrm{a} \iota$ : see notes on Phil. ii. 17. The dative $\sigma$ aphl is the dat. ' of reference,' and, with the regular limiting porwer of that case, marks that to which the àmovóa was restricted ; see notes on Gal. i. 22.
$\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \alpha$ '] 'yet on the contrary,' 'nevertheless;' the hypothetical protasis being followed by $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \alpha$ at the commencement of the apodosis; see examples in Hartung, Partik. à $\lambda \lambda \alpha ́$, , 2. 8, Vol. in p. 40. In such cases, which are not uncommon, the $\grave{\alpha} \lambda \grave{\alpha}$ preserves its primary and proper force ; ' per istam particulam quasi transitus ad rem novam significatur quæ ei, qux membro orationis conditionali erat declarata, jam opponatur,' Klotz, Devar. Vol. in. p. 93.

$$
\tau \hat{\varphi} \pi \nu \in \dot{\nu} \cdot
$$ $\mu \alpha \tau t]$ ' in the spirit; ; dative exactly similar to $\tau \hat{\eta} \sigma \alpha p \kappa \kappa$. It need scarcely be said that this is St. Paul's human spirit (Beck, Seelenl. ir. 11, p. 29 sq.), not any influence of the Holy Spirit, PseudAmbr. (compare Grot. ; Daven. unites both), which would here violate the obvious antithesis. The deduction of Wig-

## 

gers (Stud. u. Krit. 1838, p. 181) from this passage and especially from the use of ${ }^{\prime} \pi \pi \epsilon \iota \mu$, that there had been a previous rapovaía with the Col. on the part of St . Paul, is rightly rejected by De Wette and Meyer : the verb itself simply implies absence without any reference to a previous presence; the accessory thought is supplicd by the context. Contrast the other instances in the N. T., 1 Cor. v. 3, 2 Cor. x. 1, 11, xiii. 2, 10, Phil. i. 27 , in all of which $\pi \alpha ́ \alpha \in \epsilon \mu \varepsilon$ is distinctly expressed. $\quad \sigma v ́ \nu \dot{v} \mu \hat{i} \nu$ ] with you ; ' 'joined with you,' in a true and close union; compare Gal. iii. 9, where see remarks on the difference between $\sigma \grave{\nu} \nu$ and $\mu \in \tau \alpha ́$ : compare on Eph. vi. 23. $\chi \alpha i \rho \omega \nu \kappa \alpha l \beta \lambda \epsilon \in \pi \omega \nu$ к. т. $\lambda$.] 'rejoicing (with you), and seeing your order ;' modal and circumstantial clause defining the feelings with which he was present, and the accessory circumstances. There is some difficulty in the union of these two participles. After rejecting all un-
 ('gaudeo dum vidco,' Wolf), - a zeugmatic construction of the accusative with both verbs ('mit Freuden sehend,' De Wettc), -a trajection ('sceing, etc.; and rejoicing,' see Winer, Gram. \$ 54. 4, p. 417 note), - a causal use of kal ('gaudens quia cerno,' Daven., compare Syr. $\mathfrak{i p n}^{0}$ ? ), etc., we have three plausible interpretations, ( $\alpha$ ) 'rejoicing, to wit, seeing,' etc., кal boing used purely explicatively, Olsh., Winer, 2, l. c.; $(\beta)$ 'rejoicing (thereat), i.e. at being with you in spirit, and seeing, ctc.,' the subject of the $\chi$ aipet being deduced from the words immediately preceding, and the kal being simply copulative; so Meyer, and after him Eadic and Alf.; $(\gamma)^{\prime}$ rejoicing (about you) and seeing,' '̇申' v́ $\mu \hat{\nu} \nu$ being suggested by the preceding $\sigma \dot{v} \nu \dot{v} \mu \hat{i} \nu$, Winer 1, l.c., Fritz. Rom. Vol. Ir. p. 425
note. Of these (a) seems hard and artificial; $(\beta)$ imports a somewhat alien thought, for surely it was the state of the Colossians, rather than the being with them in spirit, that made the apostle rejoice; $(\gamma)$ preserves the practical connection of $\chi$ aí $\rho$. with the latter part of the sentence, but assumes an ellipse which the context does not very readily supply. It seems best then ( $\delta$ ) so far to modify $(\gamma)$ as to assume a continuation of $\sigma \dot{\forall} \nu \dot{v} \mu \hat{\nu} \nu$; the modal $\chi$ alpou expressing the apostle's general feeling of joyful sympathy (suggested by the state in which he found them), while the circumstantial $\beta \lambda \epsilon ́ \pi \omega \nu$ к. $\tau$. $\lambda$. adds a more special, and, in fact, explanatory accessory : for this use of kal (special after gencral), comp. notes on Eph. v. 18, and on Phil. iv. 12. $\tau \dot{\alpha} \xi \iota \nu]$ 'order,' i. e. 'orderly state and conduct;' $\tau \grave{\nu} \nu \tau a ́ \xi \iota \nu, \tau \grave{\nu} \nu$ єủ $\tau \alpha \xi i ́ a \nu \quad \phi \eta \sigma\{$, Chrys. ; specification of their state outwardly considered in reference to churchfellowship, and to the attention and obedience of the good soldier of Christ: $\omega$ s


 $\tau \alpha$ каیेเ $\sigma \tau \omega ́ \sigma \eta s$ каl $\mu \grave{\eta}$ oैv $\nu \tau \nu \quad \sigma \chi เ \sigma \mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu$, $\tau \delta ́ \tau \epsilon \kappa а l$ тò $\sigma \tau \epsilon р \epsilon \in \omega \mu \alpha$ rivєтal, Theoph. The allusion may be to a well organized body politic (Meyer, Alford; compare Demosth. de Rhod. Lib. p. 200) or, perhaps more probably, in accordance with the apostle's metaphors elsewhere (Eph. vi. 11 sq.) to military service ; see Wolf in loc.
$\sigma \tau \in \rho \in(\omega \mu \alpha]$ 'solid foundation,' 'firm attitude,' $\kappa \alpha \geqslant \alpha \dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon \rho \pi \rho \partial s$ $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \iota \omega \tau \alpha s \in \dot{\jmath} \tau \alpha \kappa \tau \omega ิ s$ è $\sigma \tau \omega \hat{\omega} \alpha \mathrm{s}$ кal $\beta \in \beta a l \omega s$, Chrys. ; specification of their state inwardly considered: not 'firmitas,' Syr., Eth. [both which languages have another word more exactly answering to the concrete], followed by Huther, De Wette, al., but, 'fundamentum,' Vulg., 'firmamentum,' Copt. - there being no


lexical ground for regarding the more concrete $\sigma \tau \in \rho \epsilon \in \omega \mu \alpha$ (' effect of the verb as a coneretum,' Buttm. Gr.§119.7; nearly $=$ part. in $-\mu \in \nu \circ \nu$ ) as identical in meaning with the purely abstract $\sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \in \dot{\sigma} \tau \eta s$. The word (an äm. $\lambda \in \gamma \delta \mu$, in the N. T. ; compare 1 Pct. v. 9, Acts xvi. 5) occurs frequently in the LXX, and nearly always in its proper sense, though occasionally showing the tendency of later Greek in a partial approximation to the verbal in - $\sigma t$; comp. Esth. ix. 29. The gen, may be a gen. of apposition (comp. notes on Eph. vi. 14), but scems more naturally a gen. subjecti referable to the general category of the possessive genitive. On the construction of $\pi เ \sigma \tau$. with fis, see notes on 1 Tim. i. 16, and Reuss, Theol. Chret. iv. 14, Vol. II. p. 129.
After these words we have no reason for doubting that the Church of Colossæ, though tied by heretical teaching, was substantially sound in the faith.
6. $\dot{\omega} s$ o $\left.{ }^{3} \nu \pi \alpha \rho \in \lambda \alpha, \beta \in \tau \epsilon\right]$ 'As then ye received:' exhortation founded on the words of blended warning and encouragement in the two preceding verses, oũy having its common retrospective and collective force ('ad ea quæ antea reverâ posita sunt lectorem revocat,' Klotz), and thus answering better to 'then,' Peile, than 'thercfore,' Alf.: see Klotz, Devar. Vol. II. p. 717, compare Donaldson, Gr. § 604. On $\dot{\omega}$ see notes on Tit. i. 5. The $\pi \alpha \rho \in \lambda \alpha^{\prime} \beta \in \tau \epsilon$ can hardly be 'from me,' Alf. (see on ver. 1); but, from Epaphras (ch. i. 7) and your first teachers in Christianity. Though the reference seems mainly to reception by
 the object is so emphatically specified; $\tau \grave{\nu} \mathrm{X} \rho$. ${ }^{\text {I }} \boldsymbol{\imath} \eta \sigma . \tau \delta \nu \mathrm{K} \dot{\rho} \rho$., as apparently to require a more inclusive meaning ; they received not merely the ákŋ́patov $\delta i \delta a \sigma-$ $\operatorname{\kappa \pi \lambda la\nu }$ (Theod:), the 'doctrinam Christi'
(Daven.), but Christ Himself, in Hinlself the sum and substance of all teaching (Olsh., Bisp.) ; compare Ephes. iv. 20 , and notes in loc.
$\tau \delta \nu$
Kúpio $]$ ] The Lord;' not without emphasis ; yet not so much as 'for your Lord,' Alf., after Huth. and Mey., - an interpretation which; independently of grammatical difficulties (Kúpıò 2 Cor. iv. 5, not $\tau \grave{\nu}$ Kúp., see Middleton, Gr. Art. III. 3.4), would make $\pi \alpha p a \lambda a \beta \in \hat{i} \nu$ imply rather the recognition of a principle of doctrine, than the spiritual recep-. tion of the personal Lord. The title, as both the position and article show, is plainly emphatic, - it marks . Him as Lord of all, above all Principality and Power (Eph. i. 20), the Creator of men and angels (Col. i. 16), but cannot be safely regarded as forming a tertiary predication; compare Donalds. Cratyl. § 305.
$\hat{\varepsilon} \nu \dot{\nu} \boldsymbol{u} \tau \hat{\varphi}$ $\pi \in \rho \iota \pi \alpha \tau \in \hat{i} \tau \epsilon]$ 'walk in Him,' as the sphere and element of your Christian course. Christ is not here represented as an $\delta \delta \delta$ b́s ( $\eta$ t $\pi \rho \sigma \sigma \alpha ́ \gamma o v \sigma \alpha$ єis $\tau \delta \nu$ Пarépa, Chrys.), but as an ensphering 'LebensElement' (Mey.), to which the $\pi \epsilon \rho เ \pi \alpha-$ $\tau \in \hat{\nu}$, i. e. life and all its principles and developments, was to be circumscribed; compare Gal. ii. 20, Phil. i. 20. For a practical sermon on this text, see Fa rindon, Sermon xxxir. Vol. 11. p. 165 (Lond. 1849).
 $\mu \circ v \dot{\mu} \in \nu_{0}$ l] 'having been rooted and being built up in Him;' modal definitions appended to the preceding $\pi \epsilon \rho เ \pi a \tau \epsilon i \nu$; the first under the image of a root-fast treo (hence the perf. part.), the second under that of a continually uprising building (hence the pres. part.) marking the stable growth and organic solidity of those who truly walk in Christ. The e $\nu$ aủ $\varphi$ is attached to both : Christ, as Mey.


 of mss. ; Vulg. (Clarom., 'in illo,' as also D' ${ }^{1}$; mss.; and perhaps some Vv., the
 original) ; Chrys., Theod, al., and Lat. Ff. The two words were omitted by Tisch. (ed. 2) with AC; 15 mss.; Am. Tol. (certainly not Copt., as Tisch., Alf.) ; Archel., al., - but are now rightly restored. The authority for their omission seems clearly insufficient, especially when such an omission might so easily have heen suggested by the difficulty of the construction.
observes, is both the ground in which the root is held (Eph. iii. 17), and the solid foundation on which ( 1 Cor. iii. 11) the building is raised, - the prep. $\epsilon \nu$ (not $\epsilon \pi^{3}$ av̀т $̂, ~ E p h . ~ i i . ~ 20) ~ b e i n g ~ s t u d i o u s l y ~ c o n-~$ tinued to enhance the idea èv Xpiotew that pervades the passage ; comp. Eph. ii. 21, 22. The accessory idea of the foundation is admirably conveyed by the $\dot{e} \pi l$ in the compound rerb; comp. 1 Cor. iii. 12, Eph. ii. 20. In a passage of such force and perspicuity we need not pause on the slight mixture or discordance of metaphors ; it would be difficult indeed to imagine such frnitful and suggestive thoughts conveyed in so few words.
$\kappa$ к \} $\beta \in \beta \alpha$, о́ $\mu$. $\tau \hat{\eta} \pi\{\sigma \tau \in\}]$. 'and being stablished in your faith;' the irlea ( $\tau \delta \beta \in \epsilon$ ßatov) involved in the preceding participles being still more clearly brought out, - and, as the nature of the case requires, in the present tense. The dat. $\tau \hat{\eta} \pi \boldsymbol{\pi} \sigma \tau \epsilon \iota$ is not the instrumental dat. (Mey.), but the dat. 'of reference to' (De Wette), faith being naturally regarded as the principle which needed $\beta \in \beta a i \omega \sigma L \nu$, and to which it might most appropriately be restricted : see notes on Gal. i. 22. The prep. ${ }^{2} \nu$ is inserted before $\pi i \sigma \tau \in \iota$ in Rec. [with ACD ${ }^{3} \mathrm{EKL}$ ], but is apparently rightly : rejected by Lachm. and Tisch., though only with $\mathrm{BD}^{1}$; 4 mss . ; Vulg., - the probability of an insertion being very great.
$\kappa \alpha \hat{\top} \grave{s} \epsilon \epsilon \delta \iota \delta \alpha \chi$ श.] 'even as ye were taught;' scil. to become firmly estab-
lished in faith: this they might have been taught by Epaphras (ch. i. 7) or by some of their early instructors.
$\pi \in \rho เ \sigma \sigma$. '̇ $\nu \alpha \dot{v} \tau \hat{n}$ к. $\tau . \lambda$.$] 'abound-$ ing in it with thanksgiving:' participial clause subordinate to $\beta_{\epsilon} \beta \alpha$ ớ $\mu$., mainly reiterating with a quantitatire, what had been previously expressed with a qualitative reference. Of the two prepositional adjuncts, the first $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \quad a u \jmath \eta \hat{\eta}$ is united closely with $\pi \in \rho \iota \sigma \sigma$., specifying the element and item in which the increase takes place (equivalent to abundare with an abl. ; see notes on Phil. i. 9 ), the second as the field of operation in which (Alf.), or perhaps rather the accompaniment with which (ò̀v eป̉xap., (Ecum.), the $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \sigma \sigma$. ่̇ $\nu$ тi $\sigma \tau \epsilon \iota$ was associated and, as it were, environed ; compare Luke xiv. 31, Ephes. vi. 16, 1 Cor. iv. 21, in which the gradual transition from the more distinct idea of environment to the less defined idea of accompa, niment may be easily traced ; see Green, Gr. p. 289, and notes on ch. iv. 2.
8.. $\beta \lambda \in \boldsymbol{\pi} \boldsymbol{\tau} \in \tau \in \mu$ 向 $\tau \iota s$ к.т. $\lambda$.] 'Take heed lest there shall be any one that maleth you his booty,' - you as well as the others that have been led away; 讠́uâs, as the order suggests, being slightly emphatic : see critical note. The cautionary imper. $\beta \lambda \epsilon ́ \pi \epsilon \tau \epsilon$ is found in at least six combinations in the N. T. ; (a) with a simple accus., Mark iv. 24, Phil. iii. 2 ; (b) with àmd and a gen., Mark viii. 15, xii. 38 ; (c) with $\pi \omega \bar{s}$ and the indic., Luke

Let not worldiy wisdom lead you away from Ilim who is the Ilead of all, who has quickened you, and forgiven you, and triumphed over all the powers of evil.
8. ن́uâs ëøтau| It is curions that ap]arently no critical editor except Wetst. (and recently Tisch. ed. 7) has noticed the doubtful order of these two words. Tischener (ed. 2) silently adopted ধ̌ $\sigma \tau \alpha \iota$ ט́pûs with ACDE (Larlimemn), but has now (ed. 7) righty reversed the position of the words. The order of the text is that of BKL; all m*s. ; Chr., Theot., al., - and is apparently to be preferred as the less obvious order ; so Rec, and Scholz.
viii. 18, 1 Cor. iii. 10 ; (d) with Yva and the subj., 1 Cor. xvi. 10 ; (e) with $\mu$ ǹ and the subjunctive, - the prevailing construction, Matth. xxiv. 4, Gal. v. 15, al.; $(f)$ with $\mu$ خ and the future, only here and Heb. iii. 12. The last construction is adopted in the present case as implying the fear that the case contemplated will really occur, ' ne futurus sit qui,' etc. ; see Winer, Gr. § 56. 2, p. 446, Hartung, Partik. $\mu$ 多, 5. 6, Vol. II. p. 140, and compare Herm. Soph. Elect. 992. Numerous examples of $\mu \grave{\eta}$ in different constructions after öpa к. $\tau . \lambda$. will be found in Gayler, Partik. Neg. p. $316 \mathrm{sq} . \quad \sigma v \lambda \alpha \gamma \omega \gamma \hat{\omega} \nu]$ 'bearing avay as a booty;' an $\alpha \approx \pi$. $\lambda \in \gamma \delta \mu$. in the N. T., found only in later Greek, both directly with an accus. personce, e. $g$. тapit́vov, Heliod. Eth. x. 35, and, in a more derivative sense, with an accus. rei, e. g. olkoy, Aristæn. Ep. II. 22. There seems no reason for diluting $\dot{v} \mu$ ûs ( $\sigma \nu \lambda \alpha \gamma \omega \gamma \omega ิ \nu$ т $\partial \nu \nu 0 \hat{\nu} \nu$, Theoph.) or adopting the weaker force of the verb (àmoгv$\lambda \omega ิ \nu \pi \eta \eta^{2} \pi\{\sigma \tau \iota \nu$, Theod.) : the false teachers sought to lead them away captive, body and mind ; the former by ritualistic restrictions (verse 16), the latter by heretical teaching (verse 18). On the use of the art. after the indef. $\tau$ ts, see notes on Gial. i. $7 . \quad \delta \iota \grave{\alpha} \tau \hat{\eta} s$ $\phi\left\llcorner\lambda \circ \sigma\right.$. к. $\left.\tau . \lambda_{\text {. }}\right]$ 'by means of philosophy and rain deceit,' i. e. a philosophy that is essentially and intrinsically so, the absence of both prep. and article before $\kappa \in \nu \hat{\eta} s \dot{a} \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \tau \eta s$ showing that it belongs to the same category as the foregoing
$\phi i \lambda о \sigma o \phi i \alpha$, and forms with it a joint idea;

 see Winer, Gram. § 19. 4, p. 116. Such фьлобoфía was but a $\kappa \in \nu \grave{\eta}$ à $\pi \alpha ́ т \eta$, an empty, puffed-out [comp. Benfey, Wurzellex. Vol. 11. p. 165] system of deceit and error ; compare Eplı. v. $6 . \quad$ The term фıлобофía in this passage has been abundantly discussed. There seems no sufficient reason for referring it, on the one hand, to Grecian philosophy, whether Epicurean (Clem.-Alex. Strom. I. 11 (50), Vol. 1. p. 346, ed. Pott.), Stoic and Platonic (Tertull. Prceser § 7), or lythagorean (Grot.), or on the other, to the 'relig̣io Judaica' (Kypke, Obs. Vol. 11. p. 322 ; so Loesner and Krebs), but, as the associated terms and the general contrast seem to suggest, to that hybrid theosophy of Jewish birth and Oriental affinities ( $\tau \hat{\eta} s$ фı $\lambda о \sigma .$, -the popular, current, philos. of the day), which would be likely to have taken nowhere firmer root than among the speculative and mystery-loving Phrygians of the first century ; see Neander, Planting, Vol. r. p. 321 sq . (Bohn), and the good note of Wordsw. on this verse. In estimating the errors combated in St. Paul's Epistles which were allied with Judaism, it becomes very necessary to distinguish between, (a) Pharisaical Judaism, such as that opposed in the Epistle to the Galatians; (b) Christianity tinged with Jewish usages and speculations as condemned in the Pastoral Epistles, - not heresy proper, but an adulterated Chris-


tianity (see notes on 1 Tim. i. 4), which afterwards merged into (c) speculative and heretical Judaism, as noticed in this Epistle ; perhaps of a more decided Cabbalistic origin, and associated more intimately with the various forms of Oriental theosophy : see Neander, l.c., Röthe, Anfänge, p. 320 sq. Burton, Lectures, iif. Vol. i. p. 76 (ed. 2), Reuss, Theol. Chret. vi. 13, Vol. II. p. 642 sq.
$\kappa \alpha \tau \alpha े \tau \eta े \nu \pi a \rho a ́ \delta$. $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \dot{a} \nu \hat{\nu}$.] ' $a c-$ cordiny to the tradition of men;' modal predication attached, not to $\tau \hat{\eta} S \phi \stackrel{\lambda}{ } \quad \sigma \sigma^{-}$ фías, к. т. $\lambda$. (a construction in a high degree grammatically doubtful), but to the part. $\sigma \nu \lambda \alpha \gamma \omega \gamma \omega \hat{\omega}$, defining, first positively and then negatively, the characteristics of the $\sigma u \lambda \alpha \gamma \omega \gamma i a$. Philosoplyy was the 'causa medians,' $\pi \alpha p \alpha ́ \delta . \tau \omega ิ \nu \alpha \nu ง \rho$. the 'norma' and 'modus agendi.' The gen. $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\alpha} \nu \geqslant \rho$. is apparently that of the origin (Hartung, Casus, p. 23), the тapaסoनts took its rise from, and was received from, men ; compare Gal. i. 12, 2 Thess. iii. 6. Meycr presses the art. $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\alpha} \nu \Delta \Im \rho$. (' $\tau \omega ิ \nu$ markirt die Kategorie, die 'traditio humana' als solche der Offenbarung entgegengesetzt'), but apparently unduly: the article is probably only introduced on the regular principle of correlation ; see Middleton, Gr. Art. ili. 3. 6, p. 48 (ed. Rose).
$\kappa \alpha \tau \grave{\alpha} \tau \grave{\alpha}$
бто८Х. к. т. 入.] 'according to the rudiments of the world;' second modal predication parallel to the foregoing. The antithesis ou кarà $\mathrm{X} \rho$. seems clearly to show that this expression here includes all rudimental religious teaching of nonChristian character, whether heathen or Jewish, or a commixture of both, - the first element possibly slightly predominating in thought here, the second in ver. 20. On the various meanings assigned to this difficult expression, sce notes on Gal. iv. 3.
$k \alpha \tau \grave{\alpha} \mathrm{X} \rho \iota \sigma \tau \delta \nu]$ 'according to Christ ;' clearly not, as Grot., Corn. a Lap., 'secundum doctrinam Christi,' but 'secundum Christum,' ©́s toû Xpıoтoû XcpíSoytas, Theod. (compare Chrys.) : Christ Himself, the personal Christ, was the substance, end, and norma of all evangelical teaching. A good lecture on the 'ten points of faith' is based on this text by Cyr.-Hieros. Catech. Iv.
9. \&̈ $\tau \iota$ द̇ $\nu \alpha \dot{v} \tau \hat{\varphi}]$ 'because in Hin; ' renson for the implied exclusion of all other teaching except that кaтà X $\rho \stackrel{\sigma \tau \delta \nu \text {, }}{\text {, }}$ Ėv aủ $\frac{\mathrm{e}}{\mathrm{e}}$ being prominent and emphatic, and standing in close connection with the preceding Xpıoтov, 'in Him, and in none other than Him.' Mill and Griesh., by placing a period after Xp. would seem rather to imply a reference to $\beta \lambda \epsilon ́ \pi \epsilon \tau \epsilon$ (compare Huth.), to which, however, the emphatic ė̀ $\nu$ aùt $\varphi$ seems decidedly opposed.
 'doth dwell,' - now and evermore: observe both the tense and the compound form. The former points to the present, continuing катоiкпбts of the Godhead in the glorified son of God (compare Hofmann, Schriftb. Vol. II. 1, p. 24); the latter to the permanent indwelling, the $\kappa \alpha \tau$ оıía, not тароıкia, of the $\pi \lambda \eta \rho \omega \mu \dot{a}$ शéót $\eta \tau$ os, compare Deyling, Ols. Iv. 1, Vol. Iv. p. 591, and see notes on ch. i. 19, and on Eph. iii. 17.
$\pi \hat{a} \nu \tau \delta \pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \rho$.] 'all the fulness of the Godhead,' all the exhaustless perfections of the essential being of God: not with-


 notes on ch. i. 19, where the meaning of $\pi \lambda \eta \dot{p} \omega \mu \alpha$ in this connection is briefly investigated. Any reference to the Church (Theod., but with some hesitation) is here wholly out of the question. It is only necessary to add that సิєótns must
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not be confounded with ヘิยiótทs（Rom．i． 20），as Copt．，Syr．，Jth．，and，what is more to be wondered at，Vulg．，which has certainly two distinct words：the former is Deitas，＇die Gottheit，＇＇statum ［essentiam］ejus qui sit Deus，＇August． Civ．Dei，vir．1，and points to the nature of God on the side of the actual essentia （ $\tau \delta$ eîval © $\Theta o ́ \nu$ ）；the latter＇divinitas，＇ ＇die Göttlichkeit，＇＇conditionem ejus qui sit iceios，＇and points to the divine nature on the side of its qualitas（ $\tau \grave{\partial}$ єivat ஸิยĩo ）； sce Fritz．Rom．i．20，Vol．1．p．62．The real difficulty of the verse is in the next word．$\quad \sigma \omega \mu \alpha$ TıK $\omega$ s］＇in bodily fushion，＇$\Delta \underset{x}{ } \operatorname{lic}^{\circ} \Delta{ }^{\circ}$ raliter］，Syr．，＇corporaliter，＇Vulg．The meanings assigned to this word are very numerous．If we follow the plain lex－ ical meaning of the word，and the true qualitative force of the termination－usos （＇like what？＇Donaldson，Cratyl．§ 254）， we must certainly decide that it signifies
 $\kappa \omega ิ s, ~ ' v e r e, ~ n o n ~ u m b r a t i c e ' ~(A u g u s t ., ~$ compare Hammond 2），－ö $\lambda \omega s$ ，＇totali－ tcr，＇（Capell．）．－ov̀ $\sigma \omega$ ồws sc．oủ $\sigma \chi \in \tau \iota-$ $\kappa \omega ิ s$ ，essentialiter，non relative＇（Ecum．， Usteri，Lehrb．p．308），－nor even ข́mo－ бтaтıк⿳⺈⿵⺆，＇personaliter＇（compare Cyr．－ Alex．adv．Nest．1．8，p．28），but－with reference，not so much to that which in－ dwells，as to that which is dwelt in（Hof－ mann，Schrifib．Vol．II．1，p．25），－ ＇bodily wise，＇＇in bodily fushion，＇in the once mortal，and now glorified，body of Christ；comp．Phil．iii． 21.
 oủ катà $\sigma \omega \mu a \tau t \kappa \delta \nu$ eỉos in the $\Lambda$ óyos そँбаркоs，now dwells forevermore $\sigma \omega \mu a \tau$ L－ $\kappa \omega ิ s$（Chrys．calls attention to the precis－ ion of the language ；$\mu \bar{\eta} \nu \nu \mu i \sigma \eta s=\varepsilon \partial \nu$
 gos－ё้баркоs：compare Mcyer in loc．， and Hofmann Schriftb．l．c．So De Wette，Eadic，Alford，and most mod－
ern commentators，and anciently Xthi－ opic，＇in carne s．corpore hominis，＇and apparently Athanasius contr．Arian．IIr． 8，de Susc．Hum．Vol．I．p．60，Damasc． Orthod．Fid．ini．6，except that the refer－ ence is perhaps not sufficiently extended to the present glorificd body of our Re－ decmer：see the copious reff．in Suicer， Thesaur：．s．v．Vol．11．p．1216，and com－ pare Wordsw．in loc．

10．каí $\epsilon \sigma \tau \in \kappa . \tau \cdot \lambda_{.}$］＇and（because） ye are in him filled full ；＇not exactly，＇ye are made full in Him＇（Eadic），but，as the position of $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \in$ and the order of the words seem to require，＇ye are in Him made full，＇－there being in fact a double pred－ ication，＇ye are united with Christ（do not then seek help of subordinate power）， yea and filled with all His plenitude（and so can need nothing supplementary）．？ There is no necessity to supply any defi－ nite genitive，$\tau \hat{\eta} s$ సิєótท тồ $\pi \lambda \eta \rho . \tau \hat{\eta} s$ શєє́́т．（Dc W．），$\tau \hat{\eta} s \zeta \omega \hat{\eta} s$ （Olsh．）：all wherewith Christ is full； all His gifts，and graces，and communi－ cable perfections，are included in the $\pi \lambda \eta \rho \omega \sigma t s$ ；compare the somewhat paral－ lel text Eph．iii．19，and see notes in loc． Grotius and a few others regard é eqte as an imper．parallel to $\beta \lambda \epsilon \in \pi \epsilon \tau \epsilon$ ，but are rightly opposed by all modern commen－ tators．
 ＇who is，i．e．seeing He is，the head of．all （every）Principality and Power，＇the os having a slight explanatory force（see notes on ch．i．25，and on 1 Tim．ii．4）， and tacitly evincing the folly of seeking a $\pi \lambda i n p \omega \sigma$ s from any subordinate source， or by any ceremonial agency（compare verse 11）．The reading is somewhat douhtful：Lachm．reads $\delta$ with BDEFG； Clarom．，al．，and encloses кai－ $\bar{\iota} \nu$ aù $\tau \hat{\omega}$ in a parenthesis，but as the neuter rela－ tive would seem to have arisen from a mistaken ref．of $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \quad a \dot{u} \tau \hat{\omega}$ to $\pi \lambda \eta \rho$ ．，we seem justified in retaining of with AC KL ；nearly all mss．；Chrys．，Theod．，


al., followed by Rec: and Tisch. On the use of the abstract terms $\dot{\alpha} \rho \chi \grave{\eta}$ and $\epsilon \xi=0$ $\sigma$ ia to denote orders of heavenly Intelligences, see notes and reff. on Eph. i. 21, and Suicer, Thesaur. s. v. ä $\gamma \gamma \in \lambda$ os, Vol. r. p. 30-48.
11. E่ $\nu$ §] . 'in vohom,' i. e. 'secing that in Him,' not 'per quem,' Schoettg.,
 (ver. 10), and the use of the relative similar to that of is in the foregoing clause: all that the believer can receive in spiritual blessings is already given to him in Christ (Olsh.).
$\kappa a l \pi \in \rho t \in \tau \mu \eta\{\eta \tau \in]$ 'ye were also circumcised,' viz. at your conversion and baptism, ' quum primum facti estis Christiani,' Schoettg. : not ' in whom too, ye, etc.,' Eadie, which tends to separate кai from the verb on which it throws emphasis. The Colossians seem to have been exposed to the influence of two fundamental errors; first, the belief that they were under the influence, or at any rate needed the assistance, of intermediate intelligences; secondly, the persuasion that circumcision, the symbol of purification appointed by God, must still be necessary. Both are in fact met by the single clause кaí è $\sigma \tau \epsilon-\pi \epsilon \pi \lambda \eta \rho$. (see above); this, however, is further expanded in two explanatory relatival clauses, ôs $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau t \nu$, $\kappa . \tau, \lambda$. being directed against the first
 ond ; see Hofmann, Schrifib. Vol. II. 2, p. 153. $\dot{\alpha} \chi \in ⿺ \rho о \pi$ оьй $\tau \varphi]$ 'not hand-wrought ;', they were indeed circumcised - in a spiritual and antitypical manner, as the two characterizing definitions which follow still more clearly show. The epithet $\mathfrak{\alpha} \chi \epsilon t \rho$. puts in obvious contrast the spiritual $\pi \in \rho เ \tau о \mu \grave{\eta}$ [Baptism, sce below] with the legal, typical, $\pi \in \rho เ \tau о \mu \eta ̀ ~ \chi \epsilon เ \rho о \pi о$ о́ŋтos, performed outwardly $\epsilon^{\prime} \nu$ бapki, Eph. ii. 11. Ser-
eral references to a spiritual circumcision will be found in Schoettg. Hor. Vol. I. p. 815 ; compare Deut. x. 16, xxx. 6, al. The form áXєєpot. occurs again Mark xiv. 58 (in expressed contrast), and 2 Cor. v. 1.
$\epsilon ่ \nu \tau \hat{\eta}$
$\dot{a} \pi \in \kappa \delta \dot{v} \sigma \in \ell \kappa$. т. $\lambda$.$] ' in the putting off$ of the bodly of the flesh;' not 'by means of etc.,' Mey., the prep. 'iv not having any quasi-instrumental force, but simply specifying that in which the $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \tau о \mu$ गे consisted (De W.), the external act in which it took place; compare notes on ver. 7, and Winer, Gr. § 48. a, p. 345. In all such cases the real use of the preposition is local, but the application ethical. The $\sigma \hat{\omega} \mu \alpha$ रท̂s $\sigma a \rho \kappa \partial{ }^{2}$ has been somewhat differently explained. Grammatically considered, the expression is exactly the same as in ch. i. 22 ; , бa.pкòs is the gen. of the material or specifying clement (sce notes), but its meaning and application are necessarily different. There it was the material $\sigma \dot{\alpha} \rho \xi$ of the Redeemer without any ethical significance ; here it is the material $\sigma \alpha \dot{\alpha} \rho \xi$, quâ the seat of sinful motions, practically synonymous with the more generic $\sigma \omega \mu \alpha$ ápaprias (Rom. vi. 6), and designedly used in this place to keep up the antithetical allusion to legal circumcision : the $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \tau$. $\chi \in \iota \rho о \pi$. consisted in the àmék$\delta v \sigma \iota s$ and $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \tau o \mu \grave{\eta}$ of a part (Exod. iv.
 of the whole $\sigma \hat{\omega} \mu a \tau$ ๆ̂s $\sigma$ apkós ; sce Hofmann, Schriftb. Yol. II. 2, p. 154, and Wordsw. in loc., who pertinently cites the good doctrinal comments of Hilary, de Trin. ix. 7. It is somewhat perverse in Müller, Doctr. of Sin, Vol. I. p. 359 (Transl.), p. 455 (Germ.), to salve his general interpretation of $\sigma \grave{\alpha} \rho \xi$ by here giving to $\sigma \omega \hat{\mu} \alpha$ a figurative meaning (' massa,' Calv., al.), which, even if lexically admissible, is obviously out of

## 

harmony with the concrete references （ $\sigma v \nu \tau a \phi \epsilon ́ \nu \tau \epsilon s, \sigma v \nu \eta \gamma \epsilon^{\prime} \rho \neg \eta \tau \epsilon$ ）in the con－ text．No writer has more ably vindicat－ ed the prevailing meaning of $\sigma \alpha \dot{\beta} \xi$（see notes on Gal．v．5），but that there are some passages in the N ．T．in which $\sigma \grave{\alpha} \rho \xi$ has a reference to sensationalism general－ ly，to weakness，fleshliness，and sinful motions cannot safely be denicd ；comp． with this expression，$\dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon \kappa \delta \nu \sigma \alpha \dot{\alpha} \mu \epsilon \nu 0 \iota ~ \tau \partial \nu$ $\pi a \lambda \alpha \iota \partial \nu{ }_{\alpha}^{2} \nu \lambda \rho_{0}$ ．к．$\tau . \lambda$ ．ch．iii． 9 ，and see especially the excellent article of Tho－ luck in Stud．u．Krit．for 1855，p．488－ 492．The reading of Rec．，$\sigma \omega \omega_{\mu}$ ，$\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ áuapt．тท̂s $\sigma$ ．with $\mathrm{D}^{2} \mathrm{D}^{3} \mathrm{E}^{2} \mathrm{KL}$ ，is rightly rejected by Tischener and most modern critics．$\quad \hat{\epsilon} \nu \tau \hat{\eta} \pi \in \rho \iota \tau . \tau 0 \hat{v}$ $\mathrm{X} p$.$] ＇in the circumcision of Christ，＇com－$ municated by，and appertaining unto， Christ；second characterizing definition parallel to $\epsilon^{\ell} \nu \tau \hat{\eta}$ àmeк．к．$\tau . \lambda$ ．specifying more exactly the nature of the $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \tau о \mu \eta$ à $\in \iota \rho o \pi o i ́ \eta t o s . ~ X \rho \iota \sigma \tau o \hat{v}$ is not exactly a
 Baiti $\sigma \mu a \tau \iota$ ，Theophyl．），but of the origin， or perhaps still more exactly，the origi－ nating cause（see Hartung，Casus，p．17， and notes on ch．i．23）；toút $\omega \nu$ altuos $\delta$ $\delta \in \sigma \pi o ́ t \eta s$ X $\rho \iota \sigma \tau$ ós，Theod．：Christ，by union with Himself，brings about the circumcision and imparts it to believers． To give the genitive a strongly possessive ref．，e．g．＇the circumcision undergone hy Christ，＇Schoettg．，seems，exegetical－ ly considered，very unsatisfactory ；com－ pare Olsh．in loc．The reference of à $\pi \epsilon \kappa$ ． $\kappa$ ．$\tau, \lambda$ ．and $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \tau$ ．тồ $\mathrm{X} \rho$ ．to the death of Christ（Schneckenburger，Theol．，Jahrb． for $1848, \mathrm{p} .286 \mathrm{sq}$. ．）is convincingly re－ futed by Meyer．Even Müller（on Sin， Vol．x．p．359）will take no refuge in such an interpretation．
12．$\sigma v \nu \tau a \phi \in \nu \tau \in s]$＇having been buried together with Him，＇＇when you were， etc．，＇the action described in the partici－ ple being contemporaneous with that of

тєpleт．（Mey．）；compare ch．i．20，and see Bernhardy，Synt．x．9，p．383，Stallib． on Plato，Phæedo，p． 62 D．The tempo－ ral force seems，however，here clearly secondary and subordinate，the primary force of the part．being apparently modal， and serving to define the manner in which the $\pi \epsilon \rho เ \tau o \mu \eta \mathrm{X} \rho$ ．was communicat－ ed to the believer ：compare especially Romans vi．4．There seems no reason to doubt（with Eadie）that both here and Rom．l．c．there is an allusion to the $\kappa \alpha-$
 Suicer，Thesaur．s．v．ả ${ }^{2}$ d́ $\delta$ ．Vol．I．p． 259，Bingham，Antiq．xr．11．4，and comp．Jackson，Creed，xi．17．6．That this burial with Christ is spiritually real
 тồ શavátou Xp．Theod．－Mops．on Rom． l．c．），not symbolical or commemorative， seems certain from the plain，unrestrict－ ed language of the apostle；compare Waterl．Euchar．vir．Vol．Iv．p． 577. हैข § кal $\sigma v \nu \eta \gamma$ ．］＇wherein ye were also raised with Him：＇à $\lambda \lambda$＇ov̉ $\tau$ áфos
 Chrysost．（compare Theoph．），－noticed by Mcyer，$\Lambda l f$ ．，and others as referring $\hat{\psi}$ to Xpı⿱宀б⿱⿰㇒一乂⿴⿱冂一⿰丨丨丁心㇒，but apparently without suff－ cient reason．The reference of $\bar{\psi}$ to $\mathrm{X} \rho$ ． （Mey．，Eadic）is at first sight structurally
 consideration certainly not exegetically satisfactory ；the two spiritual character－ istics，the $\tau \delta \sigma u v \tau a \phi \hat{\eta} v a l$ as shown in the
 in the $\dot{\alpha} \nu \dot{\alpha} \delta u \sigma t s$ ，must surely stand in close reference and connection with Bap－ tism．The counter－arguments of Meyer founded on the use of the prep．（ $\epsilon \nu \widehat{\psi}$ not $\vec{\epsilon} \xi$ o $\widetilde{v})$ ，and the parallelism of the prepo－

 ing．In the first place no other preposi－ tion would be so appropriate as the semi－ local $\epsilon \nu$ ；and in the second place，ôca



$\kappa . \tau . \lambda$, the statement of the causa medians, can scarcely be conceived as forming any logical parallelism with the foregoing semilocal ${ }_{\epsilon} \nu \tau \hat{\varphi} \beta a \pi \tau$. Lastly the $\kappa a l$ seems to keep both $\sigma v \nu \tau$. and $\sigma v \nu \eta \gamma$. in close correlative reference to each other.

By comparing Rom. vi. 4 , it would seem that the primary ref. of covir. is clearly to a present and spiritual resurrection, but again by comparing Ephes. ii. 6 (in which the converse seems true ; see notes), it would also appear that a secondary ref. to a future and physical resurreetion ought not to be excluded : as Jackson well says, ' of our resurrection unto glory, wo receive the pledge or earnest when we receive the grace of regeneration which enables us to walk in newness of life; and this is called the first resurrection,' Creed, xi. 17. 7 ; compare Waterland, Euchar. viI. Vol. 1v. p. 577, Reuss, Theol. Chret. Iv. 21, Vol. II. p. 235.
ठıà $\tau \bar{\eta} s \pi\left\{\iota^{\prime} \tau \epsilon \omega s\right.$ ] 'through faith:' subjective medium by which the oljective grace is reeeived: 'faith is not the mean by which the grace is wrought, effected, or conferred; but it may be and is the mean by which it is accepted or received,' Waterl. on Justif. Vol. vi. p. 23 ; compare Usteri, Lehrb. II. 1. 3, p. 216. The image of Alf., 'the hand which held on, not the plank that saved,' is, in more than one respeet, not dogmatically satisfactory.
 working of God:' not gen. of the agent or causa efficiens ( De Wette, al.), but more simply and intelligibly the gentive
 distis in] Syr., sim. . Tth., 'in fide, in auxilio' (Platt; Pol. inverts), е̇тเซтeú-

 $\pi i \sigma \tau, s$ is thus associated with a gen. rei, the gen. appears to denote the object of faith ; comp. Acts iii. 16, Phil. i. 27, 2 Thess. ii. 13. The statement of Mcy., endorsed by Eadie, and Alf. (but comp. the latter on Gal. iii. 2), that this is true in every caso except where the gen. refers to the believer, does not seem perfectly certain ; sce notes ou Gal. ii. 16, iii. 22, and Stier on Eph. Vol. r. p. 477.
$\tau \circ \hat{v}$ ह̇ $\gamma \in\{\rho \alpha \nu \tau 0 s$ к. т. ג.] Clause appended, to give a sure and certain
 Xpıotov̂ tì̀ ${ }^{2} \nu \dot{a} \sigma \tau a \sigma \iota \nu$, Theod.) of the almighty èvépreta of God, both in the present vivification to new life and the future vivification to glory (comp. Eph. i. 20 and notes in loc.) ; - 'that nothing may be done or suffered by our Saviour in these great transactions but may be aeted in our souls and represented in our spirits,' Pearson, Creed, Vol. r. p. 265 (ed. Burt.).
13. кai $\dot{v} \mu \hat{\alpha} s]$ 'and you also,' 'et ves ctiam,' Copt.; application of the foregoing to the Colossians, especially with reference to their formerly heathen state, kal being associated with ípâs and ascensive, not with ouveS. in a merely copulative sense ; see notes on Eph. ii. 1. The pronoun is repeated after $\sigma v e \mathrm{E}$. with ACKL (B, al., í $\mu$ âs ; mare than $4 \theta$ mss.; Copt., Æthiop., al.; Theod. (ms.), Dam., Ecum., and rightly adopted by Tisch. and most modern editors ; the omission [Rec. with DEFG; al.] was obviously suggested by the apparent syntactic difficulty. This, however, is very slight, as a rhetorical pleonasm of the pronoun for the sake of emplasis is not uncommon; see Bernhardy, Synt. vi. 4, p. 275.
$\nu \in \kappa \rho o$ ùs öy $\alpha a s$ ] 'being dead,' or 'when

you were dead＇（not，＇who were dead，＇ Alf．），the past sense attributed to ${ }^{\prime} \nu \tau \alpha \mathrm{s}$ being justified by the aorists which are associated with it in the sentence（Wi－ ner，$G r$. § 41．1，p．305）；see also notes on Ephes．ii． 1 （Transl．）．It seems ex－ tremely unsatisfactory in Moyer，both here and Ephes，ii．1，to give עekpoùs a proleptic reference to physical death，scil．
 àmỗaveiv，Chrys．：a remote，inferential， reference to physical death may possibly be included（see Alf．on Eph．l．c．），but any primary ref．seems wholly irrecon－ cilable with the context．
दो $\nu \tau \circ$ is $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \pi \tau$ ．］＇in your transgres－ sions；＇the prep．as usual marking the element in which the dead state was ex－ perienced ；contrast Eph．ii．1，where the $\epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \nu$ is omitted and the dat．is instrumen－ tal．The prep．is actually omitted in BL； 20 mss．；Goth．；Greck Ff．，but appy．either by accident or conformation to Eph．l．c．There does not scem reason for receding from the general distinction between $\pi а р а \pi \tau$ ．and $\alpha \mu a \rho \tau$ ．（especially when associated）advanced in notes on Eph．l．c．
$\tau \hat{\eta} \alpha \dot{\alpha} \kappa \rho \circ \beta$ ．$\tau \hat{\eta} s$ $\sigma \alpha \rho k \delta s$ ］＇the uncircumcision of your flesh，＇i．e．that appertained to，was the distinctive feature of－the gen．not be－ ing either of apposition（Storr），or quasi－ material（B．－Crus．，compare Alf．），but simply possessive．The associated words （obs the omission of the prep．）and the foregoing uso of the term（ver．11）may perhaps justify us in assigning some eth－ ical reference to $\sigma \alpha, p \xi$ ，－not merely your material（Eadie），but your sinful，unpu－ rified flesh，of which the ákpoßuбтía was the visible and external mark；they were heathens，unconverted，sinful heathens， as their very bodies could attest：this àкроßvбтía，however，had now lost its significance；they were $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \tau \epsilon \tau \mu \eta \mu$ évoı in Christ：＇Aкpoßvбтía is thus not ne－
cessarily spiritual（Deut．x．16，Jerem： iv．4），but retains its usual and proper sense ；on the derivation（not $\alpha u \kappa \rho o \nu ~ \beta u ́ \omega$ ， but a corruption of àкротобǸía）sce Fritz． Rom．Vol．I．p． 136.
$\sigma \nu \nu \in \zeta \omega \circ \pi$ o $\{\eta \sigma \in \nu]$＇He together quick－ ened，＇spiritually，－with reference to the life of grace；a secondary and inferential reference to the physical resurrection need not，however，be positively exclud－ ed ：see above，and notes on Eph．ii．5， where the force of the aorist（what is wrought in Christ is wrought＇ipso facto＇ in all united with Him）is briefly noticed； see especially Waterland，Euchar．Ix． Vol．xv．p． 643.

The great difficulty in this clause is the subject． On the one hand，a comparison with Rom．viii．11，and still more Eph．ii．5， seems to point to the last substant．$\Theta \in 6$ s， ver． 12 ；so Theod．，Theoph．，appy．Copt． ［＇secum，＇Wilk．，is a mistransl．］；and nearly all modern commentators．On the other hand，the logical difficulty of sup－ plying a nom．from the subordinate gen． $\Theta \in o v ̃$, －the obvious prominence given to Christ throughout the preceding portion －the peculiar acts described in the par－ ticiples（especially ${ }^{〔} \xi \alpha \lambda, \kappa$ ．$\tau$ 。 $\lambda$ 。 com－ pared with Eph．ii．15，and even $\chi$ aptr． compared with Col．iii．13），－the rela－ tion of Christ to $\dot{\alpha} \rho \chi$ al and दُ $\xi o v \sigma i ́ m u$（ver． 15，compare i．16，ii．10），－and lastly， the extreme difficulty of referring the aets described in ver． 14,15 ，to God the Father，are argaments so preponderant， that we can scarcely hesitate to refer $\sigma v$－ $\nu \in \zeta^{\zeta}$ ．and its associated participles to Clirist，who，as of the same essence and power with the Father and the Holy Ghost，did infallibly quicken Himself （Pearson，Creed，Art．v．Vol．r．p．302， ed．Burt．）：so Chrys．（here，e sil．，but elsewhere expressly），apparently Syriac and Goth．（certainly in ver． 15 ，see be－ low），perhaps 灰th．（Platt），and recently
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Heinr., Baur, Paulus, p. 452 note, and very decidedly, Donalds. Chr. Orthod. p. 76. It is somewhat singular that the Greek commentators Theod., Theoph., and CEcum.; silently adopt $\Theta e d s$ as the subject of verse 13 , and $\delta \Theta \epsilon \dot{s} \Lambda \dot{o} \gamma 0$ s (Theod.), as that of ver. 14,15 ; comp. also Wordsw. in loc., who conceives the propositions in this and in the following verses 'to refer to God in Christ, and to Christ as God.' Such an interpretation is dogmatically defensible on the ground of the 'communicatio idiomatum' (compare Ebrard, Chr. Dogm. § 385), and certainly deserves consideration, but viewed logically and grammatically scems somewhat artificial and unsatisfactory. We may observe lastly, that if the reference to Christ here advocated is, as it certainly seems to be, correct, it is worthy of scrious notice that actions elsewhere ascribed by the apostle to God (Eph. ii. 5, compare Rom. viii. 11), are here unrestrictedly predicated of Christ. Meyer's objection that the above interpr. is opposed to the 'Lehrtypus,' that God raised Clurist, is not very strong; God, it is here said, did raise Christ, Christ us, - yet, as God, also Himself. $\sigma \dot{v} \nu \alpha \dot{v} \tau \hat{\varphi}]$ 'with Himself.' As this seems a case in which a reference to the subject is somewhat immediate, and in which it is desirable to obviate misunderstanding, the aspirated form may be properly adopted ; comp. notes on Eph. i. 4. $\chi \propto \rho\llcorner\sigma \alpha \mu \in \nu \circ s$ к.т. $\lambda$. ' having forgiven us all our transgressions;' modal participle describing the preliminary act which conditioned the realization of the $\sigma \nu$ § $\omega \pi$ oin $\sigma t s$, by removing the true cause of the עєкрóт $\eta$ : $\pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \alpha \pi \alpha \rho a \pi \tau$.
 compare ch. iii. 13, 2 Cor. v. 19, Ephes. iv: 32 , and observe that in these last two passages $\Theta \epsilon$ ds is the subject, yet with the noticcable addition, ${ }^{\epsilon} \nu \mathrm{X} \rho เ \sigma \tau \varphi$ : For the
reading úpiv (Elz, not Steph.), there is but little critical authority. Both external and internal arguments suggest the more inclusive ñuîv.
14. $\begin{gathered} \\ \xi \\ \xi\end{gathered} \lambda \in[\psi \alpha s]$ 'having blotted out ;' modal participle contemporary with, surely not prior to (Mey.) đapı $\quad$ á $\mu \in \nu o s$, and detailing it more fully and circumstantially. Christ forgave us our sins when he took them upon Himself and suffered for us; the mode of forgiveness
 ly if this participle be applied to God, arguments might be founded on it not only in support of Patripassian doctrines, but in opposition to the vicarious satisfaction of Christ. If God the Father did all this, what was the precise effect of the expiatory death of Christ? To answer, with Eadie, 'What Christ did, God did by Him,' only evades, but does not meet, the difficulty. The form ' $\xi \xi \alpha \lambda$. (Acts iii. 19, Rev. iii. 5, vii. 17, xxi. 4 ; compare Psalm 1. 9, cviii. 13), as its derivation suggests $[\dot{\alpha}=\dot{\alpha} \nu \dot{\alpha}$, and Sanscr. lip, 'illinere,' Pott, Etym. Forsch. Vol. 1. p. 258, Vol. II. p. 153], properly denotes 'cerâ obductâ delere' (compare Krebs, Obs. p. 337), and thence, 'to expunge,' 'wipe out,' generally, in opposition to $\gamma p a ́ \phi \epsilon t \nu$, Euripid. ap. Stob. Floril. xciir. 10, p. 507 (ed. Gesn.), or é $\gamma \gamma \rho \alpha^{-}$ $\phi \in ⿺ \nu$, Plato, Rep. vi. p. 501 в, compare Xen. Hell. IY. 3. 51.
$\tau \delta \kappa \alpha \hat{N}$ ' $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \chi \in \iota \rho . \kappa . \tau . \lambda$.$] 'the$ handworiting in force against us by its decrees;' the dative $\delta 6 \gamma \mu a \sigma \omega$ belonging closely to $\tau \delta \kappa \alpha ง^{\circ} \eta \mu$. Хєцр., and falling under the general head of the dative ' of reference to' (notes on Gal. i. 22) ; the סó $\gamma \mu a \tau a$ were that in which the $\tau \delta \kappa \alpha{ }^{\circ}$ $\dot{\eta} \mu \omega \hat{\nu} \nu$ ( the hostile aspect or direction, opposed to $\dot{\pi} \pi \epsilon$ é, see Wincr, Gr. § $47 . \mathrm{k}$, p. 341 ) of the bond was specially evinced : see Winer, Gr. § 31. 10. 1, p. 197. The usual explanation, ' consisting of $\delta 6 \gamma \mu \dot{\alpha}-$
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тa,' 'rituum chirographo,' Beza, - in which the dat. would be equivalent to a kind of gen. materice, or involve a tacit ellipsis of $\dot{\epsilon} \nu$ (compare Ephes. ii. 15) seems distinctly ungrammatical, and that of Meyer, Eadic, and Alf., - according to which the dat. is governed by the verbal element in $\chi$ etpó $\gamma \rho$., - more than doubtful, as $\chi \in \iota \rho$. is a synthetic compound (Donalds. Gr. § 372), and apparently incapable of such a decomposition ; compare Tobit v. 3, ix. 5, Polyb. Hist. xxx. 8. 4. The reference of $\chi \in \epsilon \rho \delta \gamma_{\rho} \alpha_{\phi} \boldsymbol{\nu}$ has been very differently explained. The context would seem to suggest that $\chi \in \iota^{-}$ porp. is clearly not the command given to Adam (Theophyl. 2), nor the law of conscience (Luth.), nor even specially, the moral law (Calv. ; compare Neand. Planting, Vol. x. p. 462), nor yet the ceremonial law (Schoettg., Wordsw.; see especially Deyling, Ols. Part. Iv. p. 596 sq .), but the whole law, 'nam beneficium chirographi ad omnes spectat, tam Gentiles quam Judæos : ergo hujusmodi chirogr. ponere oportet, quo ex aliquâ parte tenentur omnes,' Daven. ; compare Andrewes, Serm. iv. Vol. I. p. 54 sq. ( $\mathrm{A} .-\mathrm{C}$. Libr.), and Vol. inf. p. 66, where he curiously terms it the 'ragman roll:' so De Wette, Mey., and most modern commentators. The $\chi \in t \rho$ ó $\gamma$. was $\kappa \alpha, \vartheta^{\prime}$ $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$, Jews and Gentiles; immediately against the former, mediately and inferentially (as founded on immutable principles of justice and rectitude) against the latter, Rom. ii. 15, compare Rom. iii. 19. It was in the positive commands whether written on stone or in the heart that the $\tau \delta \kappa \alpha \vartheta^{\prime} \eta \mu \omega \hat{\nu} \nu$ was mainly evinced: compare on the prohibitive side, Rom. vii. 7 sq. The law was thus appropriately designated, being a ' bond,' an 'obligatory document' (comp. Plut. Mor. p: 829 A, and see exx. in Wetst.), by which all were bound, and which
brought penalty in case of non-fulfilment; compare Pearson, Creed, Art. Iv. Vol. I. p. 248 (ed. Burt.), Usteri, Lehrb. II. 1, 2, p. 175, Reuss, Theol. Chret. Iv. 17, Vol. II. p. 190.
ठो $\bar{\eta} \nu \dot{v} \pi \in \nu a \nu \tau\{0 \nu \quad \dot{\eta} \mu$.] 'which was against us ; ' expansion of the preceding $\tau \delta \kappa a 刃^{\prime} \cup \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ : it was hostile not merely in its direction and aspects, but practically and definitely. . The idea of secret hostility ( $\hat{v} \pi \delta$ ) is not implied either here, Heb. x. 27, or indced in the majority of passages where the word occurs: see exx. in Rost u. Palm, Lex. s. v. Vol. y. p. 2064. Perhaps the prep. may have primarily involved an idea of locality, local opposition (compare Hesiod, Scut. 347,
 $\sigma \alpha v, 1$ Macc. xvi. 7) which in the metaphorical applications of the word necessarily became obliterated. This is further confirmed by the fundamental meaning of $\dot{v} \pi \delta$, which, it may be observed, is not 'under,' but appears to be that of ' motion to the speaker from that which is near to him;' see Donalds. Cratyl. \$ 279 . каl áut к. к. т. 入.] 'and He hath taken it out of the way;', change from the participial structure to that of the finite verb to add foree and emphasis (see notes on ch. i. 6, 20), and especially to the perfect [D1FG; many mss. ; Orig., Theod., al., read $\hat{\eta} \rho \in \nu$, but on insufficient authority] to express the enduring and permanent nature of the act ; sce Winer, Gr. § 40.4, p. 242 , and notes on Ephes. ii. 20. The addition ék $\mu \in ́ \sigma o v$ expresses still more fully the com-
 $\nu \in \sigma \hat{\alpha} \alpha$, , Theophyl., $\mu \grave{\eta}$ à $\phi \in i_{s}$ èml $\chi$ ẃpas, ©eum.), and perhaps also the impedimental character (Meyer) of the thing taken away ; examples of autpetv éк $\mu$ '́ $\sigma a v$ will be found in Kypke, Obs. Vol. II. p. 323. $\quad \pi \rho \circ \sigma \eta \lambda \omega \sigma \alpha s$ к. т. $\lambda$. 'having nailed it to the cross;' modal


participle, contemporaneous with the commencement of the रुркеу (Alf.), describing the manner in which Christ removed the $\chi \in i p$ ropaфov: He nailed the Mosaic law with all its decrees to His cross, and it died with Him ; aúros ко-
 $\kappa \delta \lambda_{\alpha \sigma t \nu,}$ Chrys. The reference to a bond cancelled by striking a nail through it (Pearson, Creed, Art. iv. Vol. in. p).
 $\sigma \in \nu$, Theoph.) seems very doubtful. All that the apostlo scems here to imply is, that in Christ's crucifixion, the curse of the law was borne, and its obligatory and condemnatory power, its power as
 guished and abrogated ; comp. Rom. vii. 6, and see Andrewes, Sern. Vol. I. p. 55 sq . (A.-C. Libr.).
15. $\dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon \kappa \delta \nu \sigma . \tau \grave{\alpha} s \dot{\alpha} \rho \chi \grave{\alpha} s$ к. т. $\lambda$. 'having stripped away from Himself the (hostile) principalities and powers ;' neither ' exspolians,' Vulg., silently followed by apparently all modern writers except Deyling (Obs. Vol. II. p. 609), Donaldson (Chr. Orth. p. 68), Hofmann (Schrifib. Vol. 1. p. 305), Alford, and Wordsw., nor even, 'having stripped for Himself,' ' deponere jubens,' Winer, de Verb. Comp. Iv. 15, - both interprett. wholly unsupported by the lexical usage
 u. Palm, Lex. s. vw.), and opposed to St. Puul's oun use of the word, ch. iii. 9,but 'exuens se,' Claroman., Copt. [mistransl. by Wilkins], Æth. (Platt), Chrys. 2, more distinctly Theoph. 2, and with
a special reference, Syriac


のing per exspoliationem corporis sui], Goth., 'andhamonds sik leika,' and perhaps Theod. followed by Hil., August., Pacian, and reflected in the ancient gloss
$\dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon \kappa \delta . \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \quad \sigma \alpha ́ \rho \kappa \alpha, \mathrm{FG}$; Bocrn., al. The rare binary compound à àєкठ. was apparently chosen rather than the simpler ek $\bar{\delta}$. to express, not only the act of 'divestiture,' but that of 'remoral ;' see Winer, $l$. c. It is singular that an interpretation of such antiquity, so well attested, and so lexically certain, should in modern times have been completely, if not contemptuously ignored. The meaning of the expression is, however, somewhat obscure : it appears most probably to imply that, as hinted at by Theod., and apparently all the Greek commentators, our Lord by His death stripped away from Himself all the opposing hostile powers of evil (observe the article) that sought in the nature which He had condescended to assume, to win for themselves a victory, à $\pi \epsilon \kappa \delta \delta \dot{v} \sigma \alpha \tau о ~ \tau \eta े \nu ~ \lambda \alpha \beta \eta \dot{\eta} \nu$
 тaîs àpхaîs кal raîs ėkovoiaıs, Theoph. 2, compare Theod. When He died on the cross, when He dissolved that temple in which they, both in earlier (Matth. iv. 1 sq., Luke iv. i. sq., obs. $\pi \rho \partial s$ кацрóv, ver. 13), and later, and perhaps redoubled efforts of temptation (see John xiv. 30, and especially Luke xxii. 53), had vainly endeavored to make sacrilegious entry, He reft them away forever, and vindicated His regal power (Pearson, Creed, Vol. 1. p. 260, ed. Burt.) ; yea, the loud voice (Matth. xxvii. 50, Mark xv. 37, Luke xxiii. 46) was the shout of eternal triumph and victory. See Wordsw. in loc., who has adopted the same view, and well explained the peculiar significance of the term.

Thus all seems clear, consistent, and theologically profound and significant ; while our Saviour bore the curse of the law, He destroyed its condemnatory power forever ( $\pi \in \rho t \epsilon^{-}-$ $\pi \in \iota \rho \in \nu$ é $\kappa \in \hat{\iota}$, Chrys.), while He underwent sufferings and death, and the last efforts

Let no one judge you in ceremonial observances， holding not the Head．Submit not to outward austerities that are inwardly vain and carnal．
of baffled demoniacal malignity，He de－

 pare 1 John iii． 8.
$\grave{\alpha} \rho \chi \grave{\alpha} s$ kal $\tau \grave{\alpha} s \epsilon^{\prime} \xi$ ．］＇the Principali－ ties and the Powers（that strove against Him）：＇these abstract terms being used， as always in the N ． T ．，with reference to spiritual beings（aùt o v̀s）and Intelligen－ ces（see notes on Eph．i．26，vi．12），the context showing whether the reference is to good（ch．i．16，see notes），or，as here，to evil angels and spirits；sce Us－ teri，Lelirb．II．1．2，p．176，Reuss，Theol． Chret．IV．20，Vol．II．p． 226 sq ．The opinion of Hofmann（Schrifib．Vol．r．p． 305 ），Alf．，al．，that good angels only are here referred to，and that $\dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon \kappa \delta$ ．refers to God putting aside from Him the nim－ bus of the Powers which shronded Him from the heathen world（Hofm．），is in－ genious，but not satisfactory，and further rests on the assumption that this verse refers to ©cós，not Xpi $\sigma \tau \delta$ s．
$\epsilon^{2} \delta \in \iota \gamma \mu \alpha \in \iota \sigma \in \nu$ Év $\pi \alpha \dot{\rho} \hat{p}$ ．］＇He made a show of them with boldness；not
No：［diffamavit］Syr．，sim．Goth．， ضे $\chi \eta \mu o ́ v \eta \sigma \epsilon$ ，Chrys．，compare Athiopic （Platt）and Theod．，－but simply，＇fecit cos manifestos，＇Copt．，＇ostentui esse fecit，＇Hil．：it was an open manifesta－ tion，and that too，èv $\pi a \dot{\rho} \dot{\eta} \eta \sigma_{i ́ \alpha,}$＇with boldness，＇－not opp．to èv кри⿱艹т仑̂（John
 Chrysost．，but，as the formula seems al－ ways used by St．Paul，＇confidenter，＇ Vulg：；see notes on Phil．i．20．The word $\delta \in i \gamma \mu a t i \zeta \in \omega$（Matth．i．19，Lachm．， Tisch．），apparently confined to the N．T．， does not much differ in meaning from the compound mapaঠe $1 \gamma \mu a \pi i$ Serv，exeept that it confines the idea to an open ex－ hibition（as tho context shows）in tri－ umph，without any further idea of shame or ignominy（Polybius，Hist．xvir．1．5，
xxix．7．5）．To connect $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \nu \pi \alpha \hat{\rho} \hat{p}$ ．with 2pıauß．（Hofm．Schrifib．Vol．I．p．305） seems very unsatisfactory，but has appy． arisen from the assumption that＇open－ Iy＇is the correct translation．
जp $\uparrow \alpha \mu \beta$ ．av́тov́s］＇having triumphed over them；＇contemporaneous with é $\delta \in \iota \gamma \mu$ ． （see notes on ver．12），explaining more fully the circumstances of the action． The expression Åpıaんßєúєเข тเva occurs again 2 Cor．ij．14，and apparently there （see Mey．in loc．）as necessarily here，not in a factitive sense，but with an accusa－ tive of the object triumphed over；or led in triumph；compare Plut．Comp．Thes．
 $\mu o ́ v a s$, and examples cited by Wetst．on 2 Cor．l．c．On the derivation of the word［2pl－，cogn．with Nup－，connected with $\tau p \in i s$ ，and ta $\mu \beta$ os or ${ }^{\text {á }} \mu \beta$ os，＇proces－ sion，＇or＇close dance＇］，see Donaldson； Cratyl．§ 317,318 ，and compare Benfey， Wurzellex．Vol．II．p．260．The varied nature of our blessed Redeemer＇s meek triumplis is well set forth by Hilary，de Trin．x． 48 （cited by Wordsw．）．
$\epsilon^{\epsilon} \nu$ a $v \tau \hat{\psi}$ ］＇in it；＇not $(a)$＇in the nailed up $\chi \in t \rho o ́ \gamma \rho a ф о \nu$, Mey．，which would give a force to aúr $\hat{\psi}$ with which its position and the context seem at variance；nor $(b)$ ＇in semetipso，＇Vulg．，Andrewes，Serm． Vol．III．p．66，which would form an almost unnecessary addition；but $(c)^{\text {＇in }}$
 with the Greck commentators and ma－ jority of modern expositors ：$\tau \delta$ زà $\rho$ тov̂

 Chrys．；see Pearson，Creed，Vol．I．p． 291，and especially notes，Vol．11．p． 217， 218 （ed．Burt．）．

16．$\mu$ خे 0 亏̉ $\nu$ ］＇Let not then，＇etc．；＇ with reference to ver． 14 sq. ．，oùv having its usual collective force，and recalling the readers to the fact that the Mosaic Law is now abrogated；see notes on

16. \# $\epsilon^{i} \nu$ ] Tisch. (ed. 2) reads kal ${ }^{\epsilon} \nu$ only on the authority B; Copt., Syriac; Orig. (1) ; Hier., Tichon. (Tertull. 'et' 4 times), but now (ed. 7) has rightly returned to the reading of Rec., Lachm. The common association of $\beta$ pêनts and $\pi \sigma$ ots would very naturally have sugesterl the displacement of $\eta$ for the more usual кai.
ver. 6.
$\kappa р \iota \nu \in ́ \tau \omega$ '̇̀ $\beta \rho \omega \sigma \in t]$ 'judge you in eating,' pass a judgment upon what may or may not be eaten ; $\epsilon \nu$ referring to the item in which the judgment was passed, see Rom. ii. 1, xiv. 22. Bpễts is not here 'cibus,' Vulg. (comp. Eritz. Rom. xiv. 17, Vol. III. p. 200), but, as apparently always in St. Paul's Epistles (Rom. xiv. 17, 1 Cor. viii. 4, 2 Cor. ix. 10), 'esus,' 'actus edendi,' Copt., Tittm. Synon. I. p. 159, the passive verbal being regularly used by the apostle in reference to the thing eaten ; comp. 1 Cor. III. 2, vi. 13, viii. 8, 13, x. 3, 1 Tim. iv. 3. The distinction is, however, not observed in St. John (comp. iv. 32, vi. 27), nor indeed always in classical writers, comp. Hom. Od. y. 191, vx. 176 ; Plato, Legg. vi. p. 783 c, cited by Meyer, does not seem equally certain. The rule of Thom. M.,
 Bpễts, cannot be substantiated; see notes collected by Bern. in loc., p. 174.
 being repeated to give a slight force to the enumeration. The remarks made in respect to $\beta \rho \bar{\omega} \sigma t s$ apply exactly to $\pi \delta \sigma t s$, contrast 1 Cor. x. 4 with Rom. xiv. 17 , and compare John vi. 55. As there is no command in the Mosaic law relative to $\pi \sigma \sigma \sigma t s$ except in the case of Nazarites (Numb. vi. 3) and priests before going into the tabernacle (Lev. x. 9 ), and as $\pi \delta \sigma \in t$ scems certainly to form a distinct member (opp. to Alf.), we are driven to the conclusion that the Colossian beretics adopted ascetic practices in respect of wine and strong drinks, perhaps of a Rabbinical origin. The Essenes, we know; only drank water: $\pi 0^{-}$

de Vit. Cont. § 4, Vol. II. p. 477 (edit. Mang.). $\epsilon^{2} \nu \mu \in \rho \in t$ €opr $\bar{\eta} s$ ] 'in the matter of $a_{0}$ festival:' not 'in the partial observance of festi-
 $\tau \in \rho \alpha$, Chrys.), 'ob partem aliquam festi violatam,' Day., nor 'in segregatione' (i.e. setting apart one day rather than another), Calv., comp. Syr. [in divisionibus s. distinctionibus], nor specifically, 'in the [Talmudical] tract upon,' Hamm. after Casaub. and Scal., - but, simply and plainly, 'in the matter of,' $\mu$ '́pos pointing to the 'class' or 'category' (Mcy.) ; see Plato, Republ.
 $\mu \epsilon ́ \rho \in t ~ \tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ àdııíav, Theret. p. 155 E , al., examples in Loesner Obs. p. 367, and compare 2 Cor. iii. 10 . The three objects in the matter of which judgment is forbidden, are enumerated in reference to the frequency of their occurrence ; єop$\tau \grave{\eta}$ referring to one of the greater feasts, vovunvia to the monthly festival of the new moons (Numb. x. 10 ; see Jahn, $A r$ checol. §351, Winer, $R$ WB. s. v. '‘Neumonde,' Vol. II. p. 149), and $\sigma \dot{\alpha} \beta \beta a \tau \alpha$ to the weekly festival ; comp. Gal. iv. 10.
17. \&̈ $\dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \tau \iota \nu]$ 'which things are;' relative clause showing the justice of the preceding command, the relative having a slight explanatory force; see notes on ch. i. 25,27 . That \& refers not merely to the last three items but to the whole verse, i.e. to all legal or traditionary ceremonies, seems clear from the context. The reading 8, with BFG; Clarom., Goth., al. (Lachm.), is not improbable, but is insufficiently attested.
$\sigma \kappa \cdot \alpha d]$ 'shadow ;' not 'an outline,' in reference to a бкıaypaфía, 'b beneficia

Christi ac doctrinam evangelicam obscure delincabant,' Daven., - a meaning doubtfut even in Heb. x. 1, but, as the antithesis $\sigma \hat{\omega} \mu a$ obviously requires,
$1 \frac{10 i 0}{00}$ id [umbre] Syr., shadows opposed to substance (Joseph. Bell. Jud.

 haps some further reference to the typical character of such institutions, shadows flung forward (' prenunciative observationcs,' Aug.) from the $\tau \dot{\alpha} \mu \mu^{\prime} \lambda \lambda$ ovo ${ }^{\prime} \alpha$ (scil. $\tau \grave{\alpha}$ т from the future blessings and realities of the Christian covenant; $\pi p o \lambda a \mu \beta \alpha \dot{v} \epsilon t$ ठ̀
 Theod. The use of the present $\begin{gathered}\text { éciv }\end{gathered}$ must not be unduly pressed ; 'loquitur de illis ut considerantur in suâ naturâ, abstracte a circumstantiis temporis,' Davenant. $\tau \delta \delta \delta \frac{\epsilon}{\epsilon} \bar{\omega} \mu a \mathrm{X} \rho$.] 'but the body (their substance) is Christ's :' the $\sigma \hat{\omega} \mu a$, se. $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \mu \in \lambda \lambda \partial \nu \tau \omega \nu$, belongs to Christ in respect of its origin, existence, and realization ; 'in Christo habemus illa vera et solida bona quex erant adumbrata et figurata in preedictis cerrimoniis,' Daven. The nom. might at first sight have been expected; the possessive gen. Xpıбrô̂ [so Tisch. rightly, with DEFGKL; not toô Xp. with ABC ; Lachm.], however, is of more real force, as marking that the true $\sigma \hat{\omega} \mu \propto \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \mu \epsilon \lambda \lambda \delta \nu \tau \omega \nu$ not merely was Christ, but belonged to, was derived from Him, and so could only be realized by union with Him. A reference of this clause to ver. 18 (comp. August. Epist. 59) destroys the obvious antithesis and is wholly untenable. The assertion of Alf. (comp. Olsh.) - that if the ordinance of the Sabbath had been in any form of lasting observation in the Christian Church, St. Paut could not have used such language, - cannot be substantiated. The $\sigma \alpha \beta_{\beta} \beta$ rov of the Jews,
as involving other than mere national reminiscences (with Deuteron. v. 15, contrast Exod. xx. 11), was a ซkià of the Lord's day: that a weekly seventh part of our time should be specially given up to God rests on considerations as old as the Creation ; that that seventh portion of the week should be the first day, rests on apostolical, and perlhaps inferentially (as the Lord's appearances on that day seem to show) Divine usage and appointment ; see Bramhall, Lord's Day, Vol. v p. 32 sq. (A.-C. Libr.), and Huls. Essay for 1843, p. 69.
18. $\kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \beta \rho \alpha \beta \in \nu \in ́ \tau \omega]$ ' beguile you of your reward:' so distinctly, Zonar. on Conc. Laod. Can. 35 (Suicer, Thesaur.


 marking the hostile feeling towards the proper recipient, which dictated the consequent injustice, and $\tau \delta$ т $\pi a \rho a \beta \rho \alpha \beta \in \dot{e} \epsilon \nu$; see Demosth. Mid. p. 544, ėmıoтd́ueงa

 Buttm. in loc. (Index, p. 176), who pertinently remarks, 'verbum in translato sensu aliter usurpari nón potuisse quam do co qui debitam alteri victoriam eripit.' The many renderings, either insufficient (катакрье́тш, Hesych. incorrect (кататaגaı́̇́c $\omega$, Castal. ap. Pol. Syyn.), or perverted (e. g. катакирени́́tco, Corn. a Lap.), that have been assigned to this word will be found in Pol. Synops., and in Meyer in loc.

The $\beta_{\rho \alpha a} \beta$ eiov, of which the false teachers sought to defraud the Colossians was not their Christian freedom (Grot.), 一at first sight a plausible interpretat., - but, as the context and the grave nature of the error it reveals seem certainly to suggest, 'vita æterna,' Gom., тঠ̀ $\beta p a \beta \in i ́ o \nu ~ \tau \hat{\eta} s$ ằ ' $\kappa \lambda \eta$ $\sigma \epsilon \omega s$ (Phil. iii. 14), and with a more exact allusion, the Køશaprov $\sigma$ Tépavov (1

## 


 12), $\tau \hat{s} \delta \delta \delta \xi \eta s(1$ Pet. v. 4), which the Lord, $\delta$ бíкcuos крıтйs (2 Tim. l.c.), will give to the Christian victor at the last day. This prize the fulse teachers sought to obtain, but it was under circumstances of such fatal error, viz., the worship of angels, the introduction, in fact, of fresh mediators, that they would eventually beguile and defraud of the $\beta p a \beta \in i \quad o \nu$ those who were misled enough to join them : 'nihil aliud moliuntur nisi ut palmam ipsis intercipiant, quia abducunt $\cos$ a rectitudine cursus sui,' Calv., - who, however, does not appear to have felt the precisely correct application of $\kappa \alpha \tau \alpha-$ Bpaßєúєty. ヘิ ย́ $\lambda \omega \nu$ ] 'desir-
 тои̂то тоtєî̀, CEcum. ; modal participle defining the feclings they evinced, and linting at the studied nature of the course of action which they followed, and which resulted in the кат $\alpha \beta \rho \alpha ́ \beta \in \cup \sigma \iota s$; тоиิто та́

 who, however, somewhat overpresses خ̀é $\lambda \omega \nu$, compare notes on 1 Tim. v. 14. These feelings were not directly, but in-
 $\nu 01$; the purpose was to secure the $\sigma \tau \epsilon$ ' фavos for themsclves and their followers; the result, to lose it themselves, and to defraud others of it. Two other interpretations have been proposed; $(a)$ the
 $=\beth \operatorname{qMT}_{\mathrm{T}}$ ( 1 Sam. xviii. 22, 2 Sam. xv. 26, 1 Kings xv. 26, 2 Chron. ix. 8, only, however, with a personal pronoun), adopted by Aug., al., and recently by Olshaus., but contrary to all analogy of usage in the N. T. ; and, perhaps more plausibly, (b) thie connection кат $\alpha \beta$. จє́$\lambda \omega v$, apparently favored by Syr., and, with varying shades of meaning assigned to the part., by Beza, Zanch., Tittmann
(Synon. I. p. 131), al., and most recently, Alf. The former is clistinctly untenable, as contrary to all analogy of usage of $\mathrm{Ne}^{\prime} \lambda \epsilon i \nu$ in the N. Test. The latter is structurally and grammatically defensible, compare 2 Pet. iii 5, but, even in the translation of Alf., 'of purpose defraud you,' exegetically unsatisfactory, as it would seem to impute to the false teachers a frightful and indeed suicidal malice, which is neither justified by the context, nor in any way credible. They sought to gratify thicir vanity by gaining adherents, not their malice by compassing, even at their own hazard, their ruin. The катаßрáßєvбıs was perhaps recklessly risked, but not maliciously designed beforehand. The translation of Wordsworth is much more plausible, 'by the exercise of his mere will,' but is perhaps scarcely so simple as that of the Greek commentators proposed above.
'̇ $\nu \tau \alpha \pi \in \iota \nu \circ \phi \rho$.] 'in lowtiness ;' element in which he desires to do it, the prep. $\dot{\epsilon} \nu$ not being so much instrumental (Mey.) as modal, $\pi \hat{\omega} s,{ }^{e} \nu \tau \tau \pi \epsilon t \nu . ~ ; ~ \hat{\eta} \pi \hat{\omega} s$, фибtoúmevos; ठє́ikvvat кєขoסogías ồ Tò $\pi a ̂ \nu$, Chrys. It scems clear that tarel-只ф . is not here proper Christian humility (see notes on Phil. ii. 3), but a false and perverted lowliness, which deemed Gorl was so inaccessible that He could only be approached through the mediation of inferior beings ; $\lambda \in ́ \gamma o \nu \tau \in s$


 є $\sigma \vartheta \alpha$ al, Theod. ; see also Zonaras on Can. 35, Conc. Laod. (A. D. 363 ? see Giesel. Kirchengesch. Vol. I. p. 396), where this heresy was expressly condemued; see ap. Bruns, Concil. Vol. I. p. 37.
श $\rho \eta \sigma \kappa \in\{\propto \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ à $\gamma \gamma \in ́ \lambda \omega \nu]$ 'worship of the angels ;' not gen. subjecti (James i. 26), 'quæ angelos deceat,' Wolf, with reference to the ultra-human character of

devotion which the false teachers affected (see Noesselt, Disput., Halæ, 1789), but gen. objecti (Wisdom xiv. 21, eiठíú $\omega \omega$
 p. 339), worship paid to angels; see Winer, Gr. § 20. 1, p. 168, and Suicer, Thesaur. Vol. x. p. 44. Theodoret notices the prevalence of these practices in Phrygia and Pisidia, and the existence of eủkт $\eta p$ a to Michael in his own time : even in modern times the worship of the Archangcl in that district has not become extinct; see Conyb. notes in loc., and on angel-worship generally, the good note of Wordsw. on ver. 8. Whether this had originally any connection with Essene practices, cannot satisfactorily bo determined, as the words of Joseph. Bell. Jud. II. 8. 7, are ambiguous; sce Whiston in loc. That it was practised by Gnostic sects is attested by Tertull. Prescr. § 33, Iren. Haer. I. 31. 2, Epiph. Har. xx. 2: see further references in Wolf, in loc. The evasive interpretation of $\uparrow p \eta \sigma \kappa$., talem angelorum cultum qui Christum excludat,' Corn. a Lap., 'impium angelorum cultum,' Just., is wholly opposed to the simple and inclusive meaning of the word; compare Browne, Articles, Art. xxir. p. 539.
Q $\mu \grave{\eta}$ € $\delta \rho$. $\epsilon \mu \beta$.] 'intruding into the things which he hath not seen;' $\mu$ ǹ not oủ, as the dependence of the sentence on $\mu \eta$ $\delta \in l s \tilde{v}_{\mu} a ̂ s ~ \kappa a \tau \alpha \beta \rho$. leaves the objects naturally indeterminate, and under subjective aspects ; see Winer, $G r . \$ 55,3$, p. 426 ; compare Exod. ix. 21, oेs $\mu \grave{\eta} \pi \rho o-$ $\sigma \epsilon \in \sigma \chi \in \tau \hat{n}$ סtavoía єis $\tau \delta$ § $\rho \bar{\eta} \mu \alpha$, where the use of the $\mu \eta$ somewhat similarly results from the indeterminate nature of the subject of the verb. The reading is doubtful. The negative is omitted by Lachm. [with ABD ${ }^{1}: 3 \mathrm{mss}$; Clarom., Sang., Copt. ; Tertull., Ambrst., al.], but rightly retained by Tisch. [with CD2D ${ }^{3}$ EKL ( FG ои̉к) ; nearly all mss. ; Syr. (both),

Vulg., Boern., Goth., Kth. (Platt), al. ; Origen, Chrys., Theod.], as, in the first place, external authority is distinctly preponderant; and secondly, the less usual subjective negative led to correction, and correction to omission. Mcy. and Alf. defend the omission, adopting an interpretation (' an inhabitant of tho realm of sight, not of faith,' Alf.) which is ingenious, but not very plausible or satisfactory; see Neander, Planting, Vol. 1. p. 327 note (Bohn).
' $\mathrm{E} \mu \beta a \boldsymbol{\mathrm { c }} \mathrm{\epsilon} \in ⿺ 𠃊$, with an accus. objecti, has properly a local sense, e. g. $\pi \delta \lambda \iota \nu$, Eurip. Electr. 595, vaóv, ib. Rhes. 225 (see further examples in Krebs, Obs. p. 341), and thence by a very intelligible application an ethical reference, the accusative denoting the imaginary realm to which the action extended; comp. (but with a dative) Philo, Plant. Noe, § 19, Vol. I. p. 341 (ed. Mangey), द̇ $\mu \beta a t \in$ víov- $^{-}$
 $\phi \cup \sigma \iota \frac{\cup}{\mu} \mu$.] 'vainly puffecl up;' modal clause, more fully defining ' $\epsilon \mu \beta a r \epsilon v \in \nu \nu$. The false teachers were inflated with a sense of their superior knowledge, but it was $\epsilon i k \hat{\eta}$ (Rom. xiii, 4, 1 Cor. xv. 2, Gal. iii. 4, iv. 11), bootlessly, without ground or reason. On the derivation [from єौ̌icev, perhaps Sanscr. vîcan, 'recedere '] compare, but with caution, Benfey, Wurzellex. Vol. I. p. 349. De W., following Steig., joins ek̉rŋ̂ with the preceding clause ; this is a possible, but not probable connection, as it would throw an emphasis on the adverb (comp. Gal. iii. 4) which really seems solely confined

 $\nu$ ods к. т. $\lambda$.] 'by the mind of his flesh,' $i$. e. the higher spiritual principle in its materialized and corrupted form, the genitive probably being simply possessive (compare notes on Eph. iv. 23), and the contradictory form of the combination being chosen to depict the abnormal

## 

condition ：the flesh was，as it were，en－ dued with a voûs（instead of vice versầ）， and this was the ruling principle ；sce Olsh．Opusc．p．157，Delitzsch，Psychol． iv． $5, \mathrm{p} .144$ ，and for the normal mean－ ing of $\nu o \hat{s}$ in the N．T．，notes on 1 Tim． vi．5．The odapg apparently stands in latent antithesis to the $\pi \nu \varepsilon \bar{\nu} \mu a$（compare
 Tuर̂̀s），and secms here clearly to retain its ethical sense，＇his world－mind＇（Mül－ ler，Doctr．of Sin，Vol．1．p．3．56，Clark）， his derotion to things phenomenal and material；compare Tholuck，Stud．u． Kirit．1855，p．492，Beek，Sectenl．11．18， p． 53.
 not holding fust the head ；＇où not $\mu$＇t，the negation here becoming direct and ob－ jective，and designed to be specially dis－ tinct ；compare Acts xvii．27， 1 Cor．ix． 26，and see Winer，Gr．§ 55．5，p．430， and especially Gayler，Part．Neg．p． 287 sq．，where there is a good collection of examples．Kpateiv is here used with an accus．in the same sense as in Acts iii．

 viif．20． 8 ，and denotes that individual adherence to Christ the Head which alone can constitute life and salvation ；
 $\mu \in \lambda \hat{\omega} \nu$ ，Chrysost．：compare the possible physiological reference alluded to in notes on Eph．iv． 16.
＇$\ddagger \xi$ oî］＇from which ；＇not neut．，either in reference to tò критêv，Beng．，or un－ der an abstract and generalized aspect （Jelf．Gr．§ 820．1，Krü̈ger，Spracill．§ 61. 7．9），to кє申алі́v，Mcy．，Eadic，but，as the exactly parallel passage Eph．ìv． 16 so distinctly suggests，－masc．in ref．to Xpictov̂，the subject obviously referred to in кeфa入ijp．The assertion of Meyer that the reference is not to Christ in His personal relations cannot be substantiat－
ed．The following verse seems to imply distinetly the contrary．Nor again，does it seem necessary，with the same com－ mentator，to refer $\begin{gathered}\xi \\ \xi\end{gathered}$ ov both to the par－ ticiples and the finite verb，as in Ephes． iv．19；the connection seems naturally with aügel，－the prep．$₹ \xi$ marking the source，and＇fons augmentationis；＇see notes on Gal．ii． 16.
$\pi \hat{a} \nu \quad \tau \delta \quad \sigma \hat{\omega} \mu a]$＇the whole body；＇sure－ ly not necessarily＇the hody in its every part，＇Alf．：between $\tau \delta \begin{gathered}\pi a ̂ \nu \\ \sigma \omega ิ \mu a ~(a ~ p o-~\end{gathered}$ sition of the art．very rarely found in the N．T．）and $\pi \hat{\alpha} \nu \nu \delta \partial \sigma \hat{\omega} \mu \alpha$ no distinction ean saffely be drawn．If $\pi$ âs had occu－ pied the position of a secondary predi－ cate（comp．Matth．x．30，Rom．xii．4） there would have been some grounds for the distinction．
$\delta$ な $\tau \hat{\alpha} \nu$
$\AA \phi \hat{\omega} \nu \mathrm{kal}$ Gv $\delta$ ．］＇by means of its joints and bands ；＇media of the èmiХopt－ r$\eta \sigma t s$ and $\sigma u \mu \beta i \beta a \sigma t s$ ．The d́dal and $\sigma$ vivò $\sigma \mu 0 t$ ，as the common article seems to hint，are the same in genus；the for－ mer referring，not to the＇nerves，＇Mey． （in opp．to Syr．，不th．（Platt），Coptic， and all the best $\mathrm{Vr}_{\mathrm{r}}$ ．），but to the joints， the＇commissure＇of the frame（comp． Andrewes，Serm．Vol．iII．p．96）；the latter to the varied ligatures of nerves and muscles and sinews by which the body is bound together．The distinc－ tions adopted by Mey．，al．，－according to whiclı the ápal are specially associated with èmiरó．，and referred to Faith，the $\sigma \dot{v} \nu \bar{\delta}$ ．with $\sigma v \mu \beta$ ．，and referred to Love， －are plausible，but perhaps scarcely to be relied upon．As in Eph．l．c．，the passage does not seem so much to in－ volve special metaphors，as to state for－ cibly and cumulatively a general truth；
 aüg $\epsilon$ ，Chrys．$\quad$ ？$\pi \iota \chi \circ p$ ． $\kappa$ al $\sigma v \mu$ ．］＇being supplied and knit together ；＇passive and present；the ac－ tion was due to communicated influen－


ccs, and the action was still going on. To give eimıरop. a middle sense (Eadie), 'furnished with reciprocal aid,' seems highly unsatisfactory: the pass. of the simple form is by no means uncommon; sce Polyb. IIist. III. 75. 3, vı. 15. 4, 3 Macc. vi. 40. The force of $\epsilon \pi l$ is not intensive but directive, pointing to the accession of the supply, 'cui, quæ sunt ad incrementum necessaria, sufficiuntur,' Nocsselt (sce notes on Gal. iii. 5) ; but it does not seem improbable that both in
 mary meaning, some reference to the free and ample nature of the supply, is still preserved, compare 2 Pct. i. 5, with ver. 8, and Winer on Gal. iii. 5, p. 76. On the meaning of $\sigma \nu \mu \beta$. see notes on Eph. iv. 16.
$\tau \grave{\nu} \nu \alpha$ иै $\xi$. $\tau 0 \hat{v}$ $\Theta \in o \hat{\nu}]$ ' woith the increase of God,' i.e. the increase which God supplies, tou $\Theta \in o \hat{v}$ being the gen. auctoris or originis, Hartung, Casus, 17, 23 ; compare 1 Cor. iii. 6, 7, al. To regard the expression as a periphrasis is wholly untenable; see TViner, Gr. § 36. 3, p. 221. The accus. aṽ $\eta \eta \sigma \iota \nu$ is that of the cognate subst. (not merely ' of reference,' Alf.), and serves to give force to, and develop the meaning of the verb; see Winer, G'r. § 32. 2, p. 200, Lobeck, Paralip. p. 501 sq., where this etymological figure is claborately discussed.
20. $\in \mathfrak{Z} \dot{\alpha} \pi \in$ N. к. т. $\lambda$.] 'If ye be dead with Christ;' warning against false asceticism; see notes on 1 Tim. iv. 3, and compare generally Rothe, Theol. Ethili, §. 878 sq., Vol. III. p. 120 sq. The apostle grounds his gentle expostulation on the acknowledged fact that they were sharers (by baptism, ver. 12) in the death of Christ ; in ch. iii. 1, he bases his exhortation on their participation in His resurrection. The collective oưv, and the art. before $\mathrm{X} \rho$. inserted in Rec.,
have the authority of all the MSS. against them, and are properly rejected by all modern editors. $\dot{\alpha} \pi \delta$ $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \sigma \tau 0 \iota \chi$. $\tau 0 \hat{v}$ kó $\sigma \mu \circ \mathrm{u}$ ] ‘from the rudiments of the world,' 'from ritualistic observances and all non-Christian rudiments which in any way resembled them;' see notes on ver. 8. The Law and all its ordinances were wiped out by the death of Christ (ver. 14), they who were united with Him in His death shared with Him all the blessings of the same immunity. There is no brachylogy (Hutl.) ; Christ Himself àméțavev àmठ $\nu \delta \mu o v$, when He fulfilled all its claims and bore its curse. The 'constructio prognans' $\alpha \pi \in \uparrow$. à $\pi \delta$ only occurs here in the N. T.; it is probably chosen in preference to the dat. (Rom. vii. 14, Gal. ii. 19), as expressing a more completo severance, - not only death to it, but separation and removal from it ; comp. Winer, Gr. § 47, p. 331.
$\dot{\omega} S \zeta \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \in s$ '̇े $\nu \kappa \delta \mu \mu]$ 'as if $y e$ were living in the world,' i. e. as if ye were in antithetical relations; 'ye are dead with Christ; why do ye live as if in a character exactly the reverse, as in a non-Christian realm, from all the rudiments of which ye are really dead?'
$\delta \circ \gamma \mu \alpha \tau\{\zeta \in \sigma \geqslant \epsilon]$ 'do ye submit to ordi-

 middle, - certainly not active, 'decernitis,' Vulg., 'unredib,' Goth. (a meaning here not only inappropriate but lexically incorrect), and appy. not passive, 'placitis adstringimini,' Beza; (comp. Syr.


Eth. paraphrase), as this, though perfectly lexically admissible (observo 2
 seems somewhat less in harmony with the tone of this paragraph than the 'do-


ceri vos simitis' (Grot.) of the middle;

 ner, Gr. § 39.4 , p. 295 (cl. 5), though apparently not in ed. 6 . In either case the meaning is practically the same ; in the tone of expostulation only is there a slight shade of difference.
21. $\mu \grave{\eta}$ ä $\psi n$ к. $\tau$. $\lambda$.] 'Handle not, nor taste, nor touch;' examples of the סoruati $\mu$ oेs to which they allowed themselves to submit ; 'recitative lıæe proferuntur ab apostolo,' Daven. With regard to the grammatical association, the coarser ${ }^{\circ} \psi \eta$ at the beginning, the interposed $\gamma \in \dot{v} \sigma \eta$, and the more delicate Ni $\gamma$ ns at the end might seem to justify the distinction of Meycr that the first $\mu \eta \delta \dot{\epsilon}$ is more adjunctive (see notes on Gial. i. 12 and on Eph. iv. 27), the second more ascensive, if such a distinction in so regular a sequence as $\mu \grave{\jmath} \ldots \mu \eta \delta \hat{\epsilon}_{\ldots} \ldots \mu \eta \delta \delta^{\prime}$ be not somerwhat precarious ; consider Rom. xiv. 21, and especially Luke xiv. 21, where there is a similar slight disturbance of the climax. The essenti.I character of such quasi-adjunctive enumerations is that the items are not 'apte connexa, sed potius fortuito concursur accedentia,' Klotz, Devar. Vol. II. p. 707. With regard to the objects alluded to, the interposed $\gamma \in \dot{\sigma} \sigma \eta$ and the terms of ver. 23 seem certainly to suggest a refcrence of all three verbs to ceremonial distinctions in $\beta \rho \omega \hat{\sigma} \iota s$ and $\pi \dot{\sigma} \sigma \iota \iota$ (verse 16) ; see especially Xenoph. Cyr: I. 3. 5 (cited by Raph.), where all three verbs are used in reference to food, and for examples of $\alpha \pi \tau \in \sigma \hat{*} \alpha$, see Kypke, Obs. p. 324, Loesn. Obs. p. 372. More minute distinctions, e. g. «̈ $\psi \eta$, women (Olsh.), corpses (Zanch.) ; Nírns, oil (Boehm.; compare Joseph. Bell. II. 8. 3), sacred vessels (Zanch.), al., seem very doubtful and uncertain. On the distinction
between the stronger $\alpha \pi \tau \in \sigma \hat{a} a l$ and the weaker ञิเ $\gamma \gamma$ ávet [ [OIए, TAT, tango, Pott, Etym. Forsch. Vol. I. p. 235], compare Trench, Synon. § 17.
22. \& $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \iota \nu$ к. т. 入.] 'whiek things, almost, seeing they are things, which are all to be destroyed in their consumption;' parenthetical observation of the apostle on the essential character of the meats and drinks which the false teachers invested with such ceremonial characteristics; 'ratio ducitur ab ipsâ naturâ et conditione harum rerum,' Davenant : they were ordained to be consumed and enter into fiesh physical combinations; compare Matthew xv. 17. To refer this either to the preceding commands, 'quod totum genus proceptorum,' Aug., Sanderson (Serm. vII. ad Pop.], al., or to the preceding clause as the continued statement of the false teachers, Neand. (Plant., Vol. 1. p. 328), De W., al., scems to infringe on the meaning of àmóxp $\begin{aligned} & \text { ots (sec Mcy.), and certainly }\end{aligned}$ gives a less forcible turn to the parenthesis. The objection urged by De Wette, and apparently felt in some measure by Chrysost. and Theoph. - that St. Paul wou'd thus be furnishing an argument against restrictions generally, even those sanctioned by divine authority, may be diluted by observing, (a) that a very similar form of argument occurs in 1 Tim . iv. 3 sq ., and (b) that these restrictions and observances are not condemned per se, but in relation to the new dispensation, in which all ceremonial distinctions were done away, and things remanded (so to say) to their primary conditions. $\epsilon$ is $\phi$ શ०pá $\nu$ ] 'for destruction, decomposition;' the prep. marking the destination, and $\phi$ soopd having apparently a simply physical sense; compare Syriac



bilis］，and very distinctly Theod．，eis

 $\tau \hat{\varphi}$ वे $\phi \in \delta \bar{\rho} \omega \bar{\nu} \ell$ ． $\tau \hat{\eta} \dot{\alpha} \pi o^{-}$ $\chi \rho$ ท＇$\sigma \in 2$ ］＇in their consumption，＇in their being used completely up；ov̉ бкотєīte $\dot{\text { üs }}$ $\mu o ́ \nu ı \mu \nu \nu$ тоút $\omega \nu$ oủdév，Theod．The com－ pound àmoxp．has here a somewhat similar meaning to $\delta$ axp．（comp．Rost u．Palm， Lex．s．v．），the prep．ädoे denoting＇non solum separari aliquid ab aliquo，sed ita removeri ut esse prorsus desinat，＇Winer， de Verb．Comp．Iv．p． 5 ；compare Plt1－

 cer，Thesaur．Vol．1．p．489，where sev－ eral pertinent examples are collected from the ecel．writers．
$\kappa \alpha \tau \grave{\alpha} \tau \grave{\alpha} \epsilon \bar{\epsilon} \nu \alpha \dot{\alpha} \lambda \mu$ ．］＇according to the commandments and teachings of men ；＇fur－ ther definition and specification of the preceding $\delta 0 \gamma \mu a \tau i \zeta \in \sigma \hat{\prime} \epsilon$ ；they had died with Christ，they were united with a di－ vine Deliverer，and yet were ready to submit to the ordinances and doctrines of conscience－enslaving men．The $\delta t-$ $\delta \alpha \sigma k$ ，as the exceptional omission of the article（Winer，Grain．§ 19．3，p．113） shows，belonged to the same general cat－ egory as the $i^{2} \nu \tau d d^{\prime} \mu$ ．，and are added probably by way of amplification；they were submitting to a $\delta о \gamma \mu a \tau \iota \sigma \mu \partial s$ not only in its preceptive，but even in its doctrinal，aspects ；compare Mey．in loc． Alford presses $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu{ }^{\prime} \dot{\alpha} \nu \neg \rho$ ，as describing the authors＇as generally human：＇this is doubtful；as $\epsilon^{2} \nu \tau d \lambda \mu$ ．has the article， the principle of correlation requires that d̀ $\nu$ Ņ $\rho$ ．should have it also：see Middle－ ton，Gr．Art．III．3． 6.

23．＇áтıンa］＇all which things，＇＇a set of things which；＇in reference to the preceding é $\nu \tau \dot{d} \lambda \mu$ ．каl $\delta เ \delta$. ，and specifying the class to which they belonged．On this force of $8 \sigma \tau t s$ ，see notes on Gal．iv．

24．The difference between òs and $\delta \sigma \tau$ ts is here very clearly marked；$\hat{a}$（ver．22） points to its antecedents under purely objective，äriva under qualitative and generic aspects；see Krüger，Sprachl． § 51.8 ．
$\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \iota \nu \lambda \delta \gamma$. モモ $\chi \circ \nu \tau \alpha]$＇do have the repute of wisdom，＇ ＇are enjoying the repute of wisdom，＇the verb subst．being joined，－not with the concluding clause of the verse（Conyb．， Ladie），but，as every rule of perspicnity suggests，with é $\not \subset 0 \nu \tau a$ ，and serving to mark the regular normal，prevailing char－ acter of the $\not{€} \chi \in L \nu$ ；see Winer，Gr．$\$ 45$ ． 5，p．311．The exact meaning of $\lambda$ dyov Є＇$\chi \in เ \nu$ is somewhat doubtful，as $\lambda 6$ रुos in this combination admits of at least three different meanings ；（a）＇specien，＇$\sigma \chi \hat{\eta} \mu a$ ， Theod．，Auth．Ver．，De W．，compare Demosth．Leptin．p．462，$\lambda$ órov $\tau$ tvà é $\chi o \nu$ opp．to $\psi \in \hat{\nu} \delta \bar{\delta}$ ô $\partial \nu \phi a \nu \in i ́ \eta$ ，see Elsner，Obs． Vol．11．p． 265 ；（ $\beta$ ）＇rationem，＇scil． ＇grounds for being considered so，＇Vulg．， Clarom．，and probably Syriac $1 \underset{0}{\rho_{0}}$ compare Polyb．Hist．xvir．14．5，бокоî̀
 фav $\lambda o ́ \tau a r o \nu ~ i ́ m a ́ \rho \chi \epsilon \iota \nu$ ，and other exam－ ples in Schweigh．Lex．Polyb．s．v．；$(\gamma)$ ＇famam，＇scil．＇has the repute of，＇Mey．， Alf．，and perhaps Chrys．，$\lambda 6$ yov $\phi \eta \sigma$ iv， oủ ठúvauıv：ăpa oủk ả $\lambda \eta$ ท̀ $\hat{\epsilon}$ Iav；compare
 $\Pi \nu s i \eta \nu$ àvareîoat（cited by Raph．）．Of these，though in fact all ultimately coin－ cide，$(\gamma)$ is perhaps to be preferred；＇$\tau \grave{\alpha}$ $\lambda o ́ \gamma$ ．$\epsilon^{\epsilon} \chi$ ．sunt res ejusmodi quæ quidem vulgo sapientiæ nomen habent，sed a verâ sapieutiâ absunt longissime，＇Ra－ phel，Annot．Vol．II．p．535．$\mu \in \frac{\text { e }}{} \nu$ has here no corresponding $\delta \in ́$, but serves to pre－ pare the reader for a comparison（Klotz； Devar．Vol．II．p．656）which is involved
 $\mu u \nu$ ，Chrys．），and is substantiated by the
 $\mu о \nu \eta ̀ \nu$ тท̂s баркós.
context; see Winer, Gr. § 63. 2. e, p. 507 , where other omissions of $\delta$ te are cnumerated and carefully classified.
$\dot{\epsilon} \nu \quad \epsilon \in \mathcal{A} \in \lambda \circ N \rho \eta \sigma \kappa \in\{\alpha]$ ] in self-imposed worship, - ${ }^{2} \nu$ pointing to, not the instrument by which (Mey.), but as usually, the ethical domain in which, the $\lambda$ doos roфías was acquired, or the substratum on which the $\tau \grave{\text { è }}$ е้ $\chi \in \iota \nu$ к. $\tau . \lambda$. takes place; see Winer, Gram. § 48. a, p. 345. The word $\dot{\epsilon} \hat{\imath} \in \lambda o \uparrow \rho \rho$. is apparently an $\ddot{\alpha} \pi, \lambda \epsilon-$ ró $\mu$; but by a comparison with similar
 к. т. $\lambda$. (see Rost u. Palm, Lex. Vol. I.
 as explained by Suidas (ioíi $\omega$ งิє $\lambda \dot{\eta} \mu a \tau t$ $\sigma \epsilon \in \epsilon \iota \nu \tau \downarrow$ ठокоиิ $\nu)$ may be clearly assumed to mean, 'an arbitrary self-imposed service,' - which, as the similar association with $\tau a \pi \epsilon เ \nu$, in ver. 18 seems to suggest, was evinced in the సิp $\quad \sigma \kappa \epsilon$ 'ía $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ à $\gamma \gamma \epsilon \in \lambda \omega \nu$. $\tau \alpha \pi \in \iota \nu . \kappa \alpha \grave{\alpha} \phi \in \iota \delta . \sigma \dot{\omega} \mu$.] 'lowliness and disregard, or unsparing treatment of the body:' the two other perverted elements in which the $\lambda$ ójos oodias was acquired. On $\tau \alpha \pi \epsilon \iota \nu$., which here also obviously implies a fulse, perverted humility, see notes on verse 18. The $\dot{\alpha} \phi \in t \delta_{\sigma} \sigma \dot{\omega} \mu$. marks the false spirit of asceticism, the unsparing way (compare
 in which they practised bodily austerities, the $\sigma \omega \mu a \tau \iota \kappa \geqslant े \gamma \mu \nu \alpha \sigma \sigma^{\prime} \alpha$ in which Jewish Theosophy so emulously indulged; compare notes on 1 Tim. iv 8. The omission of кal after тaтetv, and the reading áá申etōєía (B; [Lachm.], Steig.) is strenuously supported by Hofmann, Schriftb. Vol. 11. 2, p. 64, who takes it as an adjective (comp. ả $\phi \in \iota \delta \in i(\omega s$, Apoll.Rhod. III. 897), but seems both unsatisfactory and improbable.
 value serving (only) to the satisfying of the flesh.' The explanations of this very ob-
scure clause are exceedingly numerous. With regard to the first portion, two only seem to deserve consideration ; (a) that of the Greek comm., according to which $\tau t \mu \hat{\eta}$ is understood to point antithetically to the preced. $\dot{a} \phi \in \iota \delta$., and to refer to the same gen. (oủk $\dot{\varepsilon} \nu \tau \iota \mu \hat{\eta} \tau \hat{\varphi} \sigma \omega^{\prime} \mu a \tau \iota \chi \rho \hat{\nu} \nu \tau \alpha$, Theophyl.), the clause oủk $\epsilon \nu \tau \tau \mu \hat{\eta}$ being regarded as a continuance on the negctive side of what had previously been expressed in the positive : $\epsilon \neg \in \lambda . \kappa . \tau . \lambda$. were the elements in which the $\lambda$ oros oopias was, and $\tau \iota \mu \hat{\eta} \tau \iota \nu \iota$ the element in which it was not acquired ; (b) that adopted by Syr. and appy. Axth. (Platt), according to which $\tau \iota \mu \eta$ approaches to the meaning of 'pretium,' and suggests that there was something which might be a true substratum for the $\tau \delta$ 关 $\chi \in L \nu \kappa . \tau$. $\lambda_{\text {. , if }}$ if properly chosen, - ' a reputation of wisdom evinced in ${ }^{2} \uparrow ง \in \lambda$. к. $\tau$. $\lambda$., not in any practices of true value and honor ; so Beza, Beng., al., and, with slight variations in detail, Huther, Meyer, and Neand. Planting, Vol I. p. 328 (Bohn). Of these, (a) has much to recommend it; as however it suggests, if not involves, either a very unsatisfactory meaning of $\pi \rho \partial s$ $\pi \lambda \eta \sigma \mu$., 'so that the natural wants of the body are satisfied ' (Chrysost., al.), or a retrospective connection of the clause with $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \iota \nu$, or, still less likely, with $\delta a \gamma-$ $\mu a \tau i \zeta \epsilon \sigma \hat{\vartheta} \in$ (Alf.), it seems better to adopt (b), to which also the use of $\tau \iota \nu$, almost, 'no value of any kind,' seems decidedly to lean. $\quad \Pi \rho \delta \delta s \pi \lambda \eta \sigma \mu \circ \nu \dot{\eta} \nu$, added somewhat closely, then defines gravely and conclusively the real object of all these perverted austerities, - 'the satisfying of the unspiritual element, the fleshly mind ;' $\sigma a \rho \kappa \delta$ s having a retrospective reference to vods $\tau \hat{\eta} s$ $\sigma a p \kappa \delta s$ in ver. 18 , and contrasting, with great point, the means pursucd and the end really in view ; they were unsparing (à $\dot{\epsilon} \iota \delta$.) with

Mind the things above, for your life is hidden with Christ : when he is manifested so shall ye be also.
 ảע $\nu$ そ $\eta \tau \epsilon i ̂ \epsilon ;$ ổ ó X X

the $\sigma \hat{\omega} \mu \alpha$, that they might sartisfy ( $\pi \rho \partial{ }^{2}$ $\pi \lambda \eta \sigma \mu_{0}$ ) - the $\sigma$ d.pg. Syr. and Neth. insert $\alpha \lambda \lambda a$ before $\pi \rho \dot{d} s \pi \lambda \eta \sigma$.; this is not necessary ; the exposure of the motive is rendered more forcible and emphatic by the omission of all connecting particles.

Cimapter III. 1. $\epsilon i$ of $\nu]$ 'If then,' with retrospective reference to $\epsilon \mathfrak{l} \alpha{ }_{\mathrm{a}}^{\mathrm{a}} \mathrm{\epsilon} \in \mathrm{~N}$., chap. ii. 20, oûv being slightly inferential (resurrection with Christ is implied in death with Him), but still preserving its general meaning of 'continuation and retrospect,' Donalds. Gr. §604. The $\epsilon i$ is not problematical, but logical (Mey.), introducing in fact the first member of a conditional syllogism; compare Rom. v. 15, and see Fritz. in loc. In such cases, instead of diminishing, it really enhances the probability of the truth or justice of the supposition ; compare notes on Phil. i. 22. $\sigma \nu \nu \eta \gamma^{\prime} \rho \hat{\wedge} \eta \tau \epsilon$ ] ye were raised together,' scil. in baptism; not merely in a moral sense (De W.), which would render the injunction that follows somewhat superfluous: eim $\omega$,





 compare Usteri, Lehrb. II. 1. 3, p. 220. On the force and deep reality of these expressions of mystical union with Christ, compare Reuss, Thieol. Chref. Iv. 16, Vol. 11. p. 164. $\left.\tau \dot{\alpha} \not \alpha_{\alpha} \nu \omega\right]$ 'the things above:' all things pertaining to the $\pi о \lambda i \tau \in v \mu \alpha$ èv oủpavois, Phil. iii. 20, and to the Christian's true home, the
 trast being $\tau \grave{\alpha} \dot{\epsilon} \pi i$ र $\hat{\eta} s \gamma \hat{\eta} s$, ver. 2; comp.

Pearson, Creed, Art. vi. Vol. I. p. 322 (cd. Burt.). o $\quad$ í $\mathrm{X} \rho$. к.т.त.] 'where Christ is, sitting at the right hand of God;' not exactly, 'where Christ sitteth,' Auth., as there are really two enunciations, 'Christ is there, and in all the glory of His regal and judiciary pow-


 $\tau \partial \nu \nu \nu \hat{\nu} \nu \dot{\eta} \mu \omega \hat{\nu}$. àmठ $\tau \hat{\eta} s$ خ $\hat{\eta}$, Theophyl. ; comp. Chrys. On the session of Christ at the right hand of God as implying indisturbance, dominion, and judicature, see Pearson, Creed, Art. vr. Vol. 1. p. 328 , and on the real and literal sig. nificance, Jackson. Creed, Book XI. 1. The student will find a good Sermon on this text by Andrewes, Sermon vili. Vol. II. p. 309-322 (ヘ.-C. Libr.), and another by Farindon, Sermon Xlir. Volume Ii. p. 359 (London, 1849).
2. $\tau \grave{\alpha}$ \&̌ $\nu \omega \quad \phi \rho \circ \nu \in \hat{i} \tau \epsilon]$ ' mind the things above;' expansion of the preceding command, фpoveiv having a fuller meaning than $\zeta_{\eta} \eta$ eiv ; they were not only queerere but sapere. On the force of фpoveiv, compare notes on Phil. iii.. 15, Beveridge, Serm. cxxxvir. Vol. vi. p. 172 (A.-C. Libr.), and especially the able analysis of Andrewes, Serm. virr. Vol. 11. p. 315.
$\tau$ à $\epsilon \pi$ $\tau$ ท̂s. $\gamma$ गैs] 'the things on the carth;' all things, conditions, and interests that belong to the terrestrial ; compare Phil. iii. 19, of rà ėníyєla фpovồvтєs. Thero is here certainly not (a) any polemical allusion to the earthly rudiments of tho false teachers (Theoph., đicum.), for, as Meyer observes, the remaining portion of the Epistle is not anti-heretical but wholly moral and practical, - nor



(b) any special ethical allusion with ref. to ver. 5 (Estius), for the antithesis $\tau \dot{\alpha}$ ǎ $\nu \omega$ obviously precludes all such limitation. The command is unrestricted and comprehensive, ' superna curate non terrestria; ' see Calv. in lor., and the sound sermon by Beveridge, Serm. Vol. vi. p. 169 sq. (A.-C. Libr.).
3. $\dot{\alpha} \pi \in \mathcal{N} \alpha \nu \in \tau \in \gamma \alpha \rho]$ 'For ye are dead,' Alf., Wordsw., as the reference seems still to the past act, ch. 20. Conyb. urges that the associated кéкриттаi shows that the aor. is here used for a perfect. Surely this is inexact ; the aor. may, and apparently does, point to the act, the perfect to the state which ensued thereon and still continues. The nature
 clude any rigorous translation on either side. $\quad \dot{\eta} \zeta \omega \eta$ ̀ $\hat{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \dot{\nu}]$ 'your life,' - which succeeded after the à $\pi \in \mathbb{N} \alpha \alpha^{\prime} \nu \epsilon-$ $\tau \in$; your real and true life, - not merely your 'resurrection lifo,' $\Lambda l f$. ( $\tau \hat{\eta} s . \eta \eta_{\mu \epsilon \tau \epsilon ́-~}^{\text {en }}$
 but, with the tinge of ethical meaning which the word $\zeta \omega \eta$, from its significant antithesis to Návaros, always seems to involve (compare Reuss, Theol. Chret. xv. 22, Vol. II. p. 252), 'your inward and heavenly life,' of which Christ is the essence, and, so to speak, impersonation (ver. 4), and with whom it will at last receive all its highest developments, expansions, and realizations ; comp. notes on 1 Tim. iv. 8. On the meaning of $\zeta \omega \dot{\eta}$, see the grood treatise of Olshausen, Opusc. Art. viri. p. $187 \mathrm{sq} .$, and on its distinction from Bíos, Trench, Synon. § 27.
$\kappa$ ќк $\kappa v \pi \tau \alpha, \quad \sigma$ ̀̀v $\nu \hat{\varphi} \mathbf{X} \rho$.] 'hath been (avd is) hidden with Christ ;' its glory and highest characteristics are concealed from view, - not merely 'laid up,' Alford, but shrouded in tho depths of in-
ward experiences and the mystery of its union with the life of Christ. When He is revealed, then the life of which He is the source and element will be revealed in all its proportions and all its blessed characteristics : the manifestation which is now at best only partial and subjective, will then be objective and complete; compare the thoughtful remarks of Delitzsch, Bibl. Psych. v. 3, p. 298. $\grave{\epsilon} \nu \tau \hat{\varphi} \Theta \in \hat{\varphi}]$ ] 'in God;' He is the element and sphere in which the $\zeta \omega \dot{\eta}$ is concealed: in Ilim, as
 the Father in whom is the Eternal Son (John i. 18, xvii. 21), and with whom He forever reigns (ver. 1), the life of which the Son is the essence lies shronded and concealed. Considered under its inherent relations our $\langle\omega \bar{\eta}$ is concealed $\dot{\epsilon} \nu$ © $\Theta \hat{\omega}$; considered under its coherent relations it is concealed $\sigma \dot{\nu} \nu \mathrm{X} \rho เ \sigma \tau \hat{\varphi}$; compare Meyer in loc., whose interpretation of $\langle\omega i$ (' das ewige Leben') is, however, narrow and unsatisfactory.
4. $\phi$ a $\nu \in \rho \omega$ Nิ $\hat{\eta}]$ 'shall be manifested ;' scil. at His second coming, when He shall be seen as He is, and when His present concealment slall cease; oüтє $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ ט́ $\phi^{\prime}$
 $\lambda \omega \bar{s}$ à $y \nu 0 \in i ̂ t a l$, Theod. : compare' 2 Peter iii. 4. $\dot{\eta} \zeta \omega \grave{\eta} \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu]$ 'our Life,' almost, 'being our Life,' the 'predicatio,' as Daven. acutcly observes, being ' causalis non essentialis.' Christ is here termed $\dot{\eta} \zeta \omega \bar{\eta}$. $\dot{\eta} \mu \omega \bar{\nu}$, not, however, as being merely the author of it (Daven.), or the cause of it (Corn. a Lap.), much less ' in the character of it' (Eadic), but as being - our Life itself, tho essence and the impersonation of it ; compare Gal. ii. 20, Phil. i. 21. Thus Christ is termed $\dot{\eta}$ '่̇ $\pi$ ls $\tilde{\eta}^{\prime} \mu \omega \bar{\nu}, 1$ Tim. i. 1 (comp.

Mortify your members and the evil priaciples in which ye once walked ：put off the old man，and put on the new，in which all are one in Christ．

5．$\tau \dot{\alpha} \mu$ 白 $\lambda \eta \dot{u} \mu \omega \bar{\omega}\rangle$ So Rec．，Lachn．，with $\Lambda^{3}$ DEFGKL；nearly all mss．；Vulg．， Clarom．，Syr．（hoth），Copt．，Eth．（Pol．and Platt），Goth．，al．；Clirys．，Theod．，al． （Meyer，De Wette）．Tho pronoun is omitted by Tisch．（ed．2，but not ed．7），Alf．， with $\mathrm{BCl}^{1} ; 17.67$ 米米．71；Clem．（1），Orig．（5），al．The great preponderance of MSS．，and the accordant testimony of so many Vv．seem to render this otherwise not improbable omission here very doubtful．

Col．i．27），$\grave{\eta} є i p \not \eta \eta \eta ~ \grave{\eta} \mu \omega \hat{\omega}$ ，Eph．ii．14， where see notes．

The reading is very doubtful：$\dot{\eta} \mu \bar{\omega} \nu$ is adopted by Rec．，Lachm．，and Tisch．with $\mathrm{BD}^{2} \mathrm{D}^{3} \mathrm{E}^{2}$ KL；great majority of mss．；Syr．（both）， al．；Or．，CEcum．，al．On the other hand， $\dot{v} \mu \omega ิ \nu$ is supported by CD1E1FG； 5 mss．； Vulg．，Clarom．，Copt．［quoted by Tisch． and Alf．for the other reading］，Goth．， Eth．（Pol．and Platt）；many Latin and Greek Ff．As $\grave{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ is far less casy to account for than $\dot{v} \mu \omega \bar{\omega}$ ，which might have come from ver． 3 or from the $\dot{u} \mu \in \hat{i s}$ in the present verse，critical principles seem to decide for the reading of the text．
cal $\dot{v} \mu \in i s]$＇yealso ；＇yo Colossian converts，as well as all other true Chris－ tians．The more verbally exact opposi－ tion would have been＇your hidden life＇ （comp．Fell）；but this the apostle per－ haps designedly neglects，to prevent $\zeta^{\omega}$ iो being applied，as it has been applied， merely to the resurrection life．Alford urges this clause as fixing that meaning to ${ }^{\prime} \omega^{\prime}$ ；but surely the avoidance of the regular antithesis seems to hint the very reverse；$\dot{i} \mu \in i s \phi \alpha \nu \in \rho$ ，is the natural sequel of your inward and heavenly life，and is its true development．
$\dot{\epsilon} \nu \delta \delta \xi \eta$ ］＇in glory；＇compare Rom．
 $\delta \circ \xi \alpha \sigma \uparrow \omega \hat{\omega} \mu \in \nu$ ．The $\delta \delta \xi \neq$ will be the issue， development，and crown of the hidden life，and will be displayed both in the material（1 Cor．xv．43）and immaterial portions of our composite nature：＇hu－
jus æternæ vitæ promissa gloria sita cst in cuplici stolâ ；in stolâ animæ ct stolû corporis，＇Daven．The conjunction of body and soul，soul and spirit，will then be complete，harmonious，and indissolu－
 will reflect the glories of Him who is its clement and essence ：comp．Olsh．Opuse． p． 195 sq．

5．$\nu \in \mathbb{I c} \rho \omega \sigma a \tau \in$ o $\bar{\nu} \nu]$＇Malie dead then：＇＇as you dicd，and your true life is hidden with Christ，and hereafter to be developed in glory，act conformably to it，－let nothing live inimical to such a state，kill at once（aor．）the organs and media of a merely earthly life．＇O $\hat{u} \nu$ is thus，as commonly，retrospective and collective（＇ad ea quæ antea revera pos－ ita lectorem revocat，＇Klotz，Devar．Vol． 11．p．719），serving to enhance the perti－
 $\nu \in \tau \epsilon$ and $\dot{\eta} \zeta \omega \grave{\eta} \dot{\nu} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ which havo preced－ ed．$\quad \tau \grave{\alpha} \mu \epsilon ́ \lambda \eta$ ঠ́ $\mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ ］＇your members，＇the portions of your bodily or－ ganization（compare Rom．vii．5）quâ the instruments and media of sinfulness and lusts ；compare with respect to the pre－ cept，Rom．viii．13，Gal．v．24，and with respect to the image，and form of expres－ sion，Matth．v．29，30．These are more specifically defined as $\tau \alpha ̀ ~ \epsilon \grave{\epsilon} \pi t \geqslant \hat{\eta} s \gamma_{\hat{\eta} s}$ （compare ver．2），as defining the sphere of their activities（＇ubi suum habent pal－ ulum，＇Beng．），and as justifying the pre－ ceding command．
$\pi \circ \rho \nu \in\{\alpha \nu \kappa \alpha\} \dot{\alpha} \kappa \alpha \hat{\alpha} \alpha \rho \sigma\{\alpha \nu]$＇for－

6． $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \pi$ l Toùs vioùs à $\pi \epsilon เ \mathfrak{\imath}$ ．］Tisch．［Lachm．］，and $A l f$ ．omit these words with B ； Sahid．，Reth．（Pol．，but not Platt）；Clem．（1），Ambrosiast．（text）．On the one hand，it is certainly possible that they may have been inserted from the paral－ lel passage，Eph．vi． 6 ；still，on the other，the overwhelming weight of external evidence，and the probalbility，that in two Epistles where so much is alike，even individual expressions might be repeated，seem to render the omission on such evi－ dence more than doubtful．
nication and uncleanness；＇specific and gencric products of the $\tau \grave{\alpha}$ è $\pi l$ xîs $\gamma \hat{\eta} s$ $\mu^{\prime} \lambda \eta$ on the side of lust and carnality； compare Eph．v．3．There is no need to supply mentally $\nu \epsilon \kappa \rho \omega \dot{\omega} \sigma a \tau \epsilon$（Fritz． Rom．Vol．1．p．379），or to introduce paraphrastically a prep．，＇a scortatione，＇ Eth．；the four accusatives stand in an appositional relation to $\tau \alpha ̀ \mu \epsilon ́ \lambda \eta \kappa . \tau . \lambda$ ．， as denoting their evil products and op－ crations ；sce Wiuer，Gr．§ $59.8, \mathrm{p} .470$ ， and compare Matth．Gro．§ 432． 3.
 evil concupiscence ；＇further and more ge－ neric manifestations．It does not seem proper，on thic one hand，to extend $\pi \dot{\alpha}\left\{\begin{array}{c}\text { os to }\end{array}\right.$ ＇motus vitiosos，quales sunt ě $\chi$ N＇pat，épets， इそิ入ot，к．т．ג．，＇Grot．，or，on the other， to limit it to more frightful exhibitions （Rom．i．26，27）：it points rather，as the evolution of thought seems to require，to ＇the disposition toward lust，＇Olsh．，the ＇morbum libidinis，＇Beng．，－in a word， not merely to lust，but to lustfulness；

 The last，ėगเงvuía какй，is still more in－ clusive and generic ；ìठoû $\gamma \in \nu t k \omega \bar{s} \tau \grave{~} \pi \hat{\alpha} \nu$ eime，Chrys．
$\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \pi \lambda \in \sigma_{-}$ $\nu \in \xi\{a \nu]$＇Covetousness，＇－with the arti－ cle，as the notorious form of $\sin$（＇die bekannte，hauptsächlich vermeidende Unsittlichkeit，＇Winer，Gr．§ 18．8，p． 106），that ever preserves so frightful an alliance with the sins of the flesl．There seems no reason whatever to depart from the proper sense of the word；it is nei－ ther specially＇base gains derived from
uncleanness＇（comp．Storr，Flatt，al．）， nor generically，＇insatiabilem cupidita－ tem voluptatum turpium，＇Estins，＇the whole longing of the creature，＇Trench （Synon．§ $24,-a$ very doubtful expan－ sion），but simply＇covetotusness，＇＇inex－ plebilem appetitum animi quecrentis di－ vitias，＇Daven．（compare Theod，The－ oph．），a sin that especially depends on tho $\tau \grave{\alpha}$＇$\pi$ l $\tau \hat{\eta} s$ भी̂s（＇maxime cffigit ad terram，＇Beng．），and makes，not sen－ sational cravings per se，but the means of gratifying them，the objects of its in－ ferest；see especially Müller，Doctr．of Sin，I．1．3．2，Vol．1．p． 169 （Clark）， and notes on Ephes．iv． 20.
グ $\tau \iota s \in \epsilon \sigma \tau \nu \in i \delta \omega \lambda$ ．］＇the which is， seeing it is，idolatry；＇explanatory force of $\delta \sigma \tau \iota s$ ，see notes on Gal．iv．24．The remark of Theod．is very pertinent，è $\pi \in l-$ ठท）$\tau \delta \nu \mu a \mu \mu \omega \nu \hat{a} \kappa$ र́plov $\delta \quad \sigma \omega \tau \eta ̀ \rho$ $\pi \rho \sigma \sigma \eta \gamma \delta \delta^{-}$ $\rho \in \nu \sigma \epsilon \delta \delta \delta \alpha ́ \sigma \kappa \omega \nu$ ，$े s ~ \delta ~ \tau \hat{\varphi} \pi \alpha ́ \partial \epsilon \iota \tau \hat{\eta} s \pi \lambda \epsilon o-$
 The very improbable reference of $\mathfrak{j} \tau t s$ to $\mu \in ́ \lambda \eta$（Harl．on Eph．v．5），or to all that precedes（Heinr．），is rightly rejected by Winer，Gr．§ 24．3，p． 150.

6．$\delta t^{\prime}$ ád＇on account of which sins ；＇ clearly not $\delta l^{\prime}$ á，sc．$\mu$ é $\lambda \eta$（Bühr），but in reference to＇peceata præcedentia aliaque flagitia，＇Grot．：compare notes on Eph． v．6．The reading is doubtful ：$\hat{o}$ is found in C1D1E1FG；Claroman．，Sang；$\hat{u}$ in $\mathrm{ABC}^{2} \mathrm{D}^{2} \mathrm{D}^{3} \mathrm{E}^{2} \mathrm{KL}$ ；al．，and apparently rightly adopted by Lachmann and Tisch． after Rec．Though an emendation is not improbable，the preponderance of external evidence seems too distinct to bo


safely reversed.
๕$\rho \chi \in \tau \alpha!]$ 'doth come;' emphatic, both position and tense. The present lints at the enduring principles of the moral government of God; see notes on Eph. v. 5. $\dot{\eta}$ ỏ $\rho \gamma \dot{\eta} \tau 0 \hat{v} \Theta \in o \hat{v}]$ Not only here,

 toùs rotoútous Theoph. Meyer rejects this, but without sufficient reason ; see notes on Eph. v. 6.
Toùs vioùs $\tau \hat{\eta} s$ à $\pi \in t$ N.] 'the sons of disobedience;' those who reject and disobey the principles and practice of the Gospel ; sce notes on Eph. v. 6, where the same expression occurs in the same combination, and on the force of the Hebraistic circumlocution, notes on ib. ii. 2.
7. द̇ $\nu$ ois] 'among whom,' scil. vioîs $\tau \hat{\eta} s$ à $\pi \epsilon เ \hat{\text { Itéass, - not neuter ' in which,' }}$ in reference to the foregoing vices: see Eph. ii. 3, ė $\nu$ ois кal $\eta \mu \epsilon \hat{i} s$ ả $\nu \in \sigma \tau \rho \alpha ́ \phi \eta \mu \in \nu$, which, with the present (longer) reading, seems to leave no room for doubt. The objection of Olsh. that the Colossians were still walking among the viois $\tau \hat{\eta} s$ $\dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon \mathfrak{N}$. as converts, seems easily answered by observing that $\pi \in \rho \iota \pi a \tau \epsilon i \nu$, St. Paul's favorite verb of moral motion (only here and 2 Thess. iii. 11 with persons), seems always used by him to denote an actual participation in a course or manner of life ; contrast John xi. ŏ4.
$\dot{\epsilon} \zeta \hat{\eta} \tau \in \dot{\epsilon} \nu \boldsymbol{\nu}$ о these sins,' 'these things were the sphere of your existence and activities ;' the verb $\epsilon^{\prime}(\hat{\eta} \tau \epsilon$ referring to the preceding àmen. (ver. 3), and its tense portraying the then continuing state ; compare Jelf, Grr. § 401. 3. Huther and others regard toúrots as masc.: this does not seem satisfactory, as ö $\tau \epsilon \epsilon$ €'S. would be but a weak and tautologous explanation of the preceding $\bar{\epsilon} \nu$ ois $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \epsilon \pi$. жот $\quad$, and as $\langle\hat{\eta} \nu$ $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \nu$ (except in its deeper meanings, e. $g$.
$\zeta \widehat{\eta} \nu \in \in \mathrm{X} \rho . \kappa . \tau . \lambda .$, Rom. vi. 11, Gal. ii. 20) is always used by St. Paul with thinys ; compare Rom. vi. 2, Gal. ii. 20, Phil. i. 22, Col. ii. 20. Sce the examples collected by Kypke (Obs. Vol. II. p.

 all of which the non-personal substantives similarly define the sphere to which the activities of life were confined; see also examples in Wetst. in loc. The reading of Rec. aủroîs [ $\mathrm{D}^{3} \mathrm{E}^{2}$ FGKL] has insufficient critical support.
 aside ;' emphatic exhortation suggested by their present state, the forcible $\nu$ vol (Hartung, Partik. Vol. II. 24) standing in sharp opposition to the preceding $\tau \delta \tau \epsilon$, ถ̈ $\tau \epsilon$. On the figurative $\dot{\alpha} \pi \delta \hat{\vartheta} \in \sigma \hat{\uparrow} \epsilon$, opp. to $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \delta \dot{v} \sigma \alpha \sigma \hat{\vartheta} \epsilon$, compare notes on Eph. iv. 22. The translation of Eadie, 'ye too have put off,' perhaps suggested by a misunderstanding of Auth., can only be regarded as an oversight; such mistakes, however, seriously weaken our confidence in this otherwise useful writer as a sound grammatical expositor.
кal $\dot{\mu} \mu \in i s$ ] 'ye also,' yo as well as other Christians; the кal putting them here in contrast with their fellow-converts, as in ver. 7 with their fellow-heathens ; comp. notes on Plil. iv. 12.
$\tau \grave{\alpha} \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha]$ 'the whole of them:' all previously ( $\tau$ útoos, ver. 7), and hereafter to be mentioned. Winer (Gr. § 18. 1, p. 98) refers $\tau \alpha ̀ ~ \pi \alpha ́ \nu \tau \alpha$, with an intensive force, only to what had been already adduced: the enumeration which follows seems to require a more comprehensive and prospective reference; see Meser in loc. So similarly Syr., Goth. (Aith. omits), 'hæc omnia' (comparo Theod.), except that this is perhaps too exclusively prospective. There is no full stop after this word in Tisch., as is


asserted by Alf., nor apparently in any edition. ккк\{av] 'malice,' 'badness of heart,' the evil habit of the mind as contrasted with movnpia, the more definite manifestation of it ; comp. Eph. iv. 31, and Trench, Synow. § 11. On the distinction between the preceding iop $\rho \gamma \grave{n}$ (the more settled state) and సेupós (the more eruptive and temporary), see notes on Eph. iv. 31, and Trench, Synon. § 37; add also Ecum., who correctly

 ध̈ $\mu \mu$ огоs $\lambda u ́ \pi \eta$.
$\beta \lambda \alpha \sigma \phi \eta \mu\{\alpha \nu$ may be either against God or against men, according to the context (see notes on 1 Iim. i. 13); here the associated vices seem to limit the reference to the latter; đàs $\lambda o \iota \delta o p i ́ a s ~ o u ̋ t \omega ~ \lambda e ́ ~ \gamma \epsilon t, ~ T h e-~$ opl.; see notes on the very similar passage, Eph.iv. 31. $\alpha i \sigma \chi \rho \circ \lambda o \gamma i \alpha \nu]$ 'coarse (reproachful) speaking.' It is somewhat doubtful whether we are to adopt (a) the more limited meaning ' turpiloquium,' Claroman., sim. Vulg., Syr., 'aglaitivaurdein,' Goth., turpitudo,' Athiop. ; or (b) the more general, 'foul-mouthed abusiveness,' Trench (comp. Copt., where, however, it seems confounded with $\mu \omega \rho o \lambda o \gamma i(a)$, 'schandbares Reden,' Meyer. As aio $\sigma \rho$. is an $\ddot{\alpha} \pi$. $\lambda \in \gamma \delta \mu$. in N. T., and does not occur in LXX., and as both interpretations have good lexical authority, - the former, Xenoph. Laced. v. 6, Poll. Onomast. iv. 106, Clem.-Alex. Poed. in. 6, comp. Suicer, Thesaur. s. v. Vol. I. p. 136 ; Raphel, Annot. Vol. II. p. 535 ; the latter, Polyb. Hist. viri. 13. 8, and xxxr. 10. 4 , where it is associated with $\lambda o \iota \delta o \rho i \alpha$, -the context alone must decide. As this appy. refers mainly to sins against a neighbor (compare ver. 9), the balance seems in favor of (b), according to which ai $\sigma \chi \rho$. will be an extension of $\beta \lambda \alpha \sigma \phi$.,
and will imply all coarse and foulmouthed language, whether in abuse or otherwise. $\quad \epsilon \kappa \tau о \hat{v} \sigma \tau \sigma^{\prime}-$ $\mu \alpha \tau o s$ is not to be referred solely to ai $\sigma \chi \rho 0 \lambda$. (Eth.), but to the two preceding substantives, ả $\pi \delta \mathfrak{\delta} \in \sigma \mathfrak{A} \in$ being mentally supplied. It seems doubtful whether the addition marks specially the pollu-

 or the unsuitableness (Mey.) of the actions which are here described: the latter is perhaps slightly the most probable ; comp. James iii. 10.
9. $\mu \grave{\eta} \psi \in v$ ́ $\delta \in \sigma \hat{\tau} \epsilon]$ 'do not lie ;' pres., do not indulge in the practice. The addition єis $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \hat{\eta} \lambda$ ous specifies the objects toward which the practice was forbidden (compare Winer, Gram. § 49. a, p. 353), and stamps it as a social wrong. On the frightful character of untruthfulness, and its evolution from selfishness and lust, see especially Müller, Doctr. of Sin, 1. 1. 3. 2, Vol 1. p. 171 sq. (Clark). It seems best with Lachm., Tisch., and apparently most modern editors, to place only a comma between ver. 8 and 9 .
$\dot{\alpha} \pi \in \kappa \delta v \sigma \alpha \mu \in \nu \circ$ 亿]' seeing that ye have put off,' Auth. ; causal participle, giving the reason for the precept, and in point of time being prior to (Meyer), not contemporaneous with (' exspoliantes,' Vulg., Clarom.), the preceding aor. infin. $\dot{\alpha} \pi \delta^{\prime} \neq \sigma \hat{\imath} \epsilon$. Such a reference is not superfluous or inappropriate (De W.); the part. serves suitably to remind them that the condition into which they had now entered rendered a selfish and untruthful life a self-contradiction. To consider $\dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon \kappa \delta$. as beginning a new period, interrupted and resumed in ver. 12, as Hofmann, Schriftb. Vol. II. 2, p. 268, seems very harsh and improbable. On the double compound à $\pi \epsilon \kappa \delta$. see notes on ch. ii. 11.
$\tau \delta \nu \pi a \lambda \alpha \Delta \partial \nu$

## 


 тротє́рау толเтєíav, Theod., but, with a more individualizing reference, our former unconverted self, our state before regencration ; see notes on Eph. iv. 22. Davenant (comp. Calv.) refers the term to the 'insita naturæ nostre corruptio,' - a special and polemical reference, to which the context, which seems to point simply to their ante-Christian, as contrasted with their present, state ( $\tau \dot{\sigma} \tau \epsilon$, $\left.\nu v \nu^{\prime}\right)$, seems to yield no support.
$\sigma \dot{v} \nu \quad \tau \alpha i \hat{s} \pi \rho$.$] 'with his deeds;'$ slightly explanatory, marking the practical character of the developments of

10. ка! є̇ข $\delta$. $\tau \delta \nu \nu$ ย́o $\nu\rceil$ 'and have put on the new man;' closely connected with the preceding clause, and presenting, on the positive side, the act succeeding to the $\dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon \kappa \delta$. on the negative. Thie $\nu$ éos $\alpha \nu \approx \rho$. stands in contrast with the $\pi \alpha \lambda \alpha i \delta_{s}$ as specifying the newly-entered and fresh state of spiritual conditions after conversion and regeneration. In Eph. iv. 23 the term is кaıvós, as marking rather the new state in respect of quality ; compare Tittmann, Synon. I. p. 59, notes on Eph. iii. 16, iv. 24.

It is not improbable that the reference in the two passages is slightly different, there, (Eph.) as the hortatory tone suggests, the reference is primarily to renovation; here, as the argumentative allusion seems to imply, primarily to regeneration, yet in ncither, as the noticeable combinations (àvave-
 àvakalv.) further suggest, is the reference exclusive. On the distinction, seo Waterland, Regen. Vol. Iv. p. 433 sq., compare Trench, Synon. § 18.
T $\delta \nu$ à $\nu a \kappa \alpha, \nu$.$] ' who is being renewed;'$ characteristic, not merely of ă $\nu \lambda \rho \rho \omega$ -
 as the promincace of the epithet clearly
requires. This process of àvakaívoots, of which the causa instrumentalis and agent (Tit. iii. 5, compare Eph. iv. 23) is the Holy Spirit, is represented as continually going on ; comparo 2 Cor. iv.
 кal ท̀ $\mu$ épa. The prep. à $\nu \grave{\alpha}$ appears to mark restoration to a former, not necessarily a primal, state; see Winer, de Verb. Comp. III. p. 10, compare notes on Eph. iv. 23. $\quad \epsilon$ is है $\pi\{\gamma \nu \omega \sigma \iota \nu\}$ ' unto complete knowledge,' apparently of God, and the mystery of redemption
 pare ch. i. 9, ii. 2, Ephes. i. 17; ' in eo quod ait qui renov. in agnitionem, demonstrabat quoniam ipse ille qui ignorantiæ erat homo, id est, ignorans Deum; per (?) eam quæ in eum est agnitionem renovatur,' Iren. Heer. v. 12. On the full meaning of $\overline{\epsilon \pi} \pi \gamma^{2}$. ('accurata cognitio'), see notes on Eph.l.c., and compare on Col. ii. 2. This was the object towards which the à $\nu a k \alpha \iota v$, tended (not the sphere in which, Auth., Copt.), - the result which it was designed to attain ; comp. Eph.iv. 13. $\kappa \alpha \tau^{2}$ єikóva к. т. $\lambda$.] 'after the image of Him that created him.' By a comparison with the similar and suggestive passage, Eph. iv. 23 , there can scarcely be a doubt that this clause is to be connected with $\alpha \nu \alpha-$ kalv., not with ėmi $\gamma \nu \omega \sigma \iota \nu$.(Meyer, comp. Hofm, Schriftb. Vol. 1. p. 252), - a construction grammat. admíssible (see Win. Gr. § 20. 4, p. 126), but not exegetically satisfactory. Katà will thus point to the 'norma' or model (notes on Gial. iv. 28), and the cikc̀v roû ктí. to the image of God (Theod.), not of Christ (Chrysost. ; compare Müller, Doctr. of Sin, Vol. II. p. 392, Clark), in which the first man was created, which was lost by sin, but ' is to be restored again by a real though not substantial change,' Pearson, Creed,



 peace of God rute in you. Sing aloud, and in your hearts, to God, and dive thanks.

Art. Ix. Vol. x. p. 149 (ed. Burt.) ; 'in, eo quod dicit secundum imag. conditoris recapitulationem manifestavit ejus hominis qui in initio secundum imaginem factus est Dei,' Iren. Haer. v. 12, comp. Delitzsch, Bibl. Psychol. 11. 2, p. 5l, who conceives that with the spiritual, a physical depravation of the image was also included. To assert that a reference to a restoration of the image of God in the first creation involves 'an idea foreign to Scripture' (Alf., comp. Müller, Doctr. of Sin, Vol. II. p. 393, Clark), seems somewhat sweeping ; see notes on Eph. iv. 24, and the passages collected from the early eccl. writers in Bull, Engl. Works, Disc. v. p. 478 sq., and especially p. 492. On the meaning of єiкс $\nu$, see Trench, Synon. 15. aủ $\tau \delta \nu]$
 W.), which seems opposed to the logical and grammatical connection, and is not required by the preceding interpretation. Whether God be defined as $\delta$ ктiбas in reference to the first, or to the second creation (ả้áктıбts, Pearson, Creed, Vol. 11. p. 80, Burt.), does not alter the doctrinal truth involved in the words ' quod perdidimus in Adam, id est sccundum imaginem et similitudinem esse Dei, hoc in Christo Jesu recipimus,' Irenæus, Her. mix. 18.
11. $\partial \pi \pi 0 v$ ] 'where;' 'quâ in re' ('apud quem,' 不th.), scil. in which condition of $\dot{\alpha \pi} \epsilon \boldsymbol{\kappa} \delta \nu \sigma t s$ of the old, and ধ̌vסvats of the new man; compare Xenophon, Mem. iry. 5. i, and Kühner, in loc., cited (but incorrectly) by Meyer.
oủk モ̆ע [] 'there is not;' see notes on Gal. iii. 28, where the grammatical character of this contraction is briefly dis-
cussed. "E $\quad$ " $\lambda \eta \nu \kappa \alpha l$ 'Iov ' Greek and Jew;' antithesis involving national distinctions, followed by a second ( $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \tau$. kal àкр.) involving ritual characteristics, and by a climax ( $\beta \alpha \alpha^{\prime} \beta$., Žúv.) in reference to habits and civilization ('Scythæ barbaris barbariores,'
 seph. contr. $\Lambda p .11 .37$; see examples in Wetst. in loc.), and lastly, by a third unconnected antithesis ( $\delta o \tilde{v} \lambda o s$, é $\lambda \in u ́ v$. .) involving social relations. Between the last two Lachm. inserts кaí, with AD1E FG; 3 mss. ; Vulg., Clarom., al. : the external authority is fair, but the probability of a conformation to the preceding very great. The addition of kal by $\mathrm{D}^{1} \mathrm{E}^{1} \mathrm{FG}$ after $\beta \alpha \alpha^{\prime} \beta \beta$. seems a clear interpolation, thus rendering the testimony of the same MSS. of doubtful value in the next pair. To insert 'and' in translation (Scholef. Hints, p. 113) seems quite unnecessary. $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \tau \grave{\alpha}$ $\pi \alpha \nu \tau \alpha$ к. $\tau . \lambda$.$] 'but Chrrst is all and$ in all;' similar in meaning to $\pi$ ápres
 but with a somewhat more comprehensive enunciation: 'Christ' (placed with emphasis at the end, Jelf, Gram. § 902 , 2) is the aggregation of all things, distinctions, ' prerogatives, blessings, and moreover is in all, dwelling in all, and so uniting all in the common element of

 Chrys. For examples of civval tà $\pi \alpha ́ \nu \tau a$ or $\pi$ d́ $\nu \tau \alpha$ [as AC, and many mss. in this place] in ref. to an individual, see the very large collection in Wetstein on 1 Cor, xv. 28.
12. $\epsilon \nu \delta \dot{\prime} \sigma \alpha \sigma \vartheta \in \circ \hat{\delta} \nu]$ 'Put on then;'?


exhortation naturally following from the fact that the עéos ávàpomos which involved all the ahove blessings had been put on ; 'as you have put on the new man, put on all its characteristic qualities.' The oưv has thus appy. more of its reflexive force ; 'it takes up what has been said and continues it,' Donalds. Cratyl. § 192; compare notes on Phil. ii. 1. $\dot{\omega} \epsilon^{\epsilon} \kappa \lambda$. $\left.\tau o \hat{v} \Theta \in o \hat{v}\right]$ ' as chosen ones of, God; ' as being men who enjoy and value so great and so singular a blessing as to have been called out of heathen darkness to the knowledge of Christ; compare Tit. i. 1. Meyer acutely calls attention to the fact that $\dot{\omega}$ ${ }^{2} \kappa \lambda \epsilon \kappa т o l$ echoes the preceding argumentative a $\pi \epsilon \kappa \delta \cup \sigma$., and thus stands in logical and exegetical connection with what procedes. It is doubtful whether a $\gamma$ tob кal $\eta \gamma \alpha \pi \eta \mu$. are to be regarded as usert substantively (' ut sancti et dilecti,' Feth., - Pol., but not Platt), and as co-ordinate to, or as simple predicates to, the precerling èk入єктol $\tau o \hat{v} \Theta \in o v ̂$. The pure substantival use of the latter expression in St. Paul's Epistles (Rom. viii. 33, Tit. i. 1, compare 2 Tim. ii. 10), coupled with the fact that the force of the exhortation rests on their character as è $\kappa \lambda \epsilon \kappa \tau о$ oí, not as being dyıo kal $\eta \gamma=a \pi$., renders the Iatter connection most plausible ; so Beng., and after him Mey., and the majority of modern editors and expositors. Chrysost. and Theoph. appear to have regarded them as three attributes; so Daven., Huther, al.
$\sigma \pi \lambda \alpha \gamma \chi \nu a$ oikt $\iota \rho \mu \circ \hat{v}]$ 'bowels of mercy;' bowels which are characterized by, are the seat of mercy, the gen. being that of the 'predominating quality,' and probably falling under the general head of the genitive possessivus; see Scheuerl. Synt. § 16. 3, p. 115, and compare Luke i. 78, $\sigma \pi \lambda d^{\prime} \gamma \chi \nu$ a ${ }^{\text {é }} \boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ '́ous. The expression
is probably a little more emphatic than the simple oikttpuoús (Heb. x. 28), or the

 For exx. of the tropical use of $\sigma \pi \lambda \alpha \alpha^{\prime} \gamma \nu \alpha$, which, however, is here not necessarily required (compare Meyer), see Philippians i. 18, ii. 1 , and notes in loce. The plur. oiktıpūิע (Rec.) has only the support of K ; mss. ; Theod., al., and is rightly rejected by Lachm. and Tisch.
$\chi \rho \eta \sigma \tau \delta \tau \eta \tau \alpha]$ ' lkindness:' 'benevolence and sweetness of disposition as shown in intercourse with one another;? joined in Tit. iii: 4 with $\phi เ \lambda \alpha \nu \uparrow \rho \omega \pi i \alpha$, and in Rom. xi. 22 opp. to àтотоцía; sce notes on Gal. v. 22.
$\tau \propto \pi \in \iota \nu \circ \phi \rho \circ \sigma$.] 'lowliness (of mind);' the thinking lowly of ourselves because
 $\tau$ is. $\omega \nu \pi \bar{\omega} s$ दे $\sigma \omega \hat{\omega} \eta s$, ả $\phi o \rho \mu \grave{\eta} \nu \pi \rho \partial े s ~ \grave{a} \rho \in \tau \eta े \nu$ $\lambda a \mu \beta \alpha \dot{\nu} \epsilon \iota s \tau \eta \nu \mu \nu \eta \mu \eta \nu$, Chrys. on Eph: iv. 2, here more exact than in his definitions collected in Suicer, Thesaur. s. v. On the true meaning of this word see the valuable remarks of Neander, Planting, Vol: I. 483 , Trench, Synon. § 42 , and notes on Eph. iv. 2. $\quad \pi \rho \alpha \dot{v} \tau \eta \tau a]$ ' meekness,' in respect of God, and toward one another; see notes on (xalat. v. 23, and on EPh. iv. 2, in which latter passage it occurs in exactly the same position with respect to $\tau a \pi \epsilon \epsilon \nu$, and $\mu a \kappa \rho o s v-$ $\mu i a$. Eadie objects to the primary reference to God, but apparently without sufficient reason: that $\pi \rho \alpha \dot{u} \tau \eta s$ is frequently used in purely human relations is quite true (compare 'Titus iii. 2, $\pi \rho a \dot{u} \tau$. $\pi \rho d s$ $\pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \alpha s$ à $\nu \ni \rho \omega \dot{\omega} \pi$ ous), but that its basis is a meek acceptance of God's dealings with us seems clearly shown in Matth. xi: 29, where it is an attribute of the Saviour, and in Gal. vi. 1, and perhaps 1 Cor. iv. 21 and 2 Tim. ii. 25, where a sense of dependence on God forms the very


groundwork of the exhortation. In such passages mero gentleness seems quite insufficient. On $\mu$ акроэ̀ula opp. to ôgušupia (James i. 19), see notes on Eph. iv. 2.
13. $\dot{a} \nu \in \chi \delta \mu \in \nu 0 t$ à $\lambda \lambda$.] ' forbearing one another ; ' exhibition of the last two, and perhaps more particularly of the last, of the above-mentioned virtues ; com-
 à $\lambda \lambda$. év ả $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \pi \eta$. There docs not seem any necessity for enclusing the whole verse (Griesb., Lachm., Buttm.), nor even кaЭ̀̀s kal...v́peis (Winer, Gir. § 64, ed. 5), in a parenthesis. The structure and sequence of thought seem uninterrupted; while the first participial clause expands the preceding substantives, the second is enhanced by an adverbial clause which in its second member carries with it the preceding participle $\chi$ apt $\leftrightarrows \delta \mu \in \nu 0 \iota$; see Winer, Grr. § 62. 4, p: 499, ed. 6.
 each other;' compare Epli.iv. 32. The change to the reflexive pronoun in two members so perfectly similar (Eph. l.c. is a little different) is perhaps not accidental ; while $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \hat{\jmath} \lambda \omega \nu$ marks an act to be done by one Christian to his fellow Christian, éautois may suggest the performance of an act faintly resembling that of Clirist's, namely, of each one toward all, - yea even to themselves included ('volismet ipsis,' Vulg.), Christians being members of one another;


 àvaф́́ $\rho \in \tau \alpha$, Origen on Elph.l.c. (Cramer, Cat. Vol. 1. p. 311 ), here perhaps more appropriate.
$\mu \circ \mu \phi \dot{\eta} \nu$ ]
' (ground of) blame.' This form is an
${ }_{\alpha} \pi \pi a \xi \in \lambda \in \gamma \mu$. in the N. T., but, especially in combination with ${ }^{\prime} \chi \omega$, sufficiently common in classical Greek ; see exam-
ples in Wetstein in loc., and in Rost u . Palm, Lex. s. v. The glosses $\mu \epsilon ́ \mu \psi เ \nu$ [D ${ }^{1} \mathrm{E}$ ?] and $\delta \rho \gamma \dot{\eta} \nu$ [FG] are obviously suggested by the non-appearance of the word elsewhere in the N. T. or in the LXX.
 'even as Christ also forgave you ;' comp. ch. ii. 13 , where the same divine act is, as it would there seem, similarly attributed to Christ ; contrast Eph. iv. 32; where it is referred to $\delta \Theta \in \partial s \epsilon^{e} \nu \mathrm{X} \rho$. Kàtós (comp. on G'al. iii. 6), associated with the kal of comparison (Ǩlotz, Devar. Yol. II. p. 635) and balanced by the following oüt $\omega$ к кal, here simply introduces
 od.) : in Eph. l. c.; as the imperatival structure suggests, it has more of an argumentative tinge; see notes in loc. The reading is slightly doubtful : Kipoos is adopted by Lachm. with $\mathrm{ABD}^{1}$ FG; 1 mss. ; Vulg., Clarom., al. ; Aug. al., but is not improbably due to some attempts at conformation to Eph. iv. 32.
$\kappa$ кal $\dot{\mu} \mu \in i s]$ Scil. $\chi a p ı \zeta \delta \mu \in \nu o l$, the structure remaining participial : see Winer, Gr. § 62. 4, p. 499. The principal Vv.

Syr. (coena [condonate]), Clarom. ('ita ct vos facite'), Goth. ('taujaip'), Eth. (' facite'), and Theod. supply the imperative, which in some MSS. [D ${ }^{1} E^{1}$ FG: al., $\pi 0 \iota \epsilon \hat{\tau} \tau]$ is actually expressed : this, however, certainly seems at variance with the structure, and interrupts the otherwise easy sequence of clauses ; so rightly De Wette and Meyer. On the double кal in sentences composed of correlative members, see Klotz, Devar. Vol. II. p. 635, and notes on Ephes. v. 23 , where the usage is briefly investigated.
14. $\epsilon \pi$ l $\pi \hat{\alpha} \sigma i \nu \delta \dot{\epsilon} \tau o u ́ \tau o i s]$ 'but over all these things;' not, as in Eph. vi. 14 (see notes in loc.), with a simplo

## 

force of accession or superaddition，Syr．
 nibus］，Neth．，but，as the more distinct expression and especially the foregoing image seem to require，with a semi－local force（＇super，＇Vulg．，＇ufar，＇Goth．），the dative with $\epsilon \pi \hbar$ as usual conveying the idea of closer and less separable connec－ tions；see notes on Eph．ii．20，but trans－ pose（ed．1）the accidentally misplaced ＇latter＇and＇former．＇Love toward all （comp．on Phil．i．9）was thus to be the garb that was to be put on over all the other elements in the spiritual ěv $\nu \delta \sigma \tau$ ．
8］＇which（element）；＇neuter，the ante－ cedent being viewed under an abstract and gencralized aspect ；see Jelf，Gram． § 820．1，Krüger，Sprachl．§ 61．7． 9. The reading is not perfectly certain； int $/$（Rec．）is fairly supported $\left[\mathrm{D}^{2} \mathrm{D}^{3} \mathrm{E}\right.$ KL ；many Ff．］，and is certainly in ac－ cordance with St．Paul＇s（explanatory） use of the indef．relative in similar pas－ sages；still the probability of a gram－ matical gloss seems here so great，that the roading of Luchm．and Tisch．is to be distinctly preferred．
$\sigma \dot{v} \nu \delta \in \sigma \mu \circ$ os $\tau \hat{\eta} s \tau \in \lambda \in t \delta \tau \eta \tau 0 s]$＇the bond of perfectness，＇Auth．；not＇of com－ pleteness，＇Alf．，which would be a more suitable translation of $\dot{\boldsymbol{\lambda} о к \lambda \eta р i ́ a ; ~ c o m p . ~}$ Trench，Synon．§ 22．The genitival re－ lation has been somewhat differently ex－ plained；the abstract gen．may be（a） the gen．of quality，in which case $\tau \in \lambda \in \epsilon$ tó ． would be little more than an epithet， ＇the most perfect bond，＇Hamm．，Grot．， and even Green，Gram．p． 247 ；（b）the gen．of content，＇amor complectitur vir－ tutum universitatem，＇Bengel，compare Bull，Exam．Cens．II．5，一 т̂̂s $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon t o ́ \tau$. marking that which the $\sigma \dot{v} \nu \delta$ ．enclosed within it，De W．，Olsh．，compare Usteri， Lehrb．II．1．4，p． 242 ；or（c）the genit． objecti；$\tau \hat{\eta} S$ тe入etot．being that which
is held together by it，and on which it exercises its conjunctive power ；$\pi \alpha ́ \nu \tau \alpha$ ย̇кєîva avít $\sigma v \sigma \phi ‘ \gamma \gamma \epsilon \hat{\imath}$, Theophyl．：so Chrys．，Theod．，apparently Syr． 1 ês ［cinctorium］，and more recently Steig． and Meyer．Of these（c）has clearly the advantage，as not involving either a doubtful genitive or an unsatisfactory，if not indemonstrable meaning of $\sigma \dot{v} \nu \delta \in \sigma$－ mos（comp．Meyer）；as，however，it as－ signs a questionable collective force to
 $\tau \alpha$ ，Chrys．，Theoph．，it seems more ex－ act to regard the genitive as，$(d)$ a gen． subjecti belonging to the general category of the gen．possess．；love is the bond which belongs to，is the distinctive fea－ ture of perfection ：contrast Eph．iv．2， and compare notes in loc．The omission of the article may bo due to the verb substantive ；see Middleton，Gr． Art．III．3．2，p． 43 ．（ed．Rose）．

15．єípरívך то̂ $\mathrm{X} \rho$ ．］＇the peace of Christ ；＇gen．auctoris，or perhaps rather originis（Hartung，Casus，p．17，see on ch．i．23），＇the peace which comes from Him who is our peace（Ephes．ii．14）， and who solemnly left His peace to His church＇（John xiv．27）；द̇кeívךv（eipク́－
 The peace of Christ must not be restrict－ ed merely to $\delta \mu \delta{ }^{2}$ oua，though this is ap－ parently the more immediate reference in the present passage，but includes that decp peace and tranquillity which is His blessed gift，and emanates from His Cross ；compare єip $\eta \dot{\nu} \eta$ ©єô̂，Phil．iv．7， in which the idea is substantially the same，except that perhaps peace is there contemplated as in its antithesis to anx－ ious worldliness（see notes in loc．），while here it is rather to the hard，unloving， and unquict spirit that mars the union of the $\hat{\epsilon} \nu \sigma \hat{\omega} \mu \alpha$ ．The reading $\tau o \hat{u} \Theta \epsilon o \hat{u}$ （Rec．）is fairly supported［ $\mathrm{C}^{2} \mathrm{D}^{3} \mathrm{EJK}$ ；


16. є̀v $\tau \alpha i ̂ s ~ k a p \delta i ́ a ı s] ~ S o ~ G r i e s b ., ~ S c h o l z, ~ L a c h m ., ~ w i t h ~ A B C D 1 F G ; ~ 10 ~ m s s . ; ~ a p-~$
 (Rec., Tisch. ed. 2, 7) is (a) so feebly supported, - only by D³ELL (MSS. here of (loultful authority from showing other traces of conformation to Eph. v. 19) ; great mass of mss. ; Clem., Theod. (text), al., and (b) so very probably an assimilation to Eph. l. c. (E, however, there reads 'zv rais кapo.), that it is difficult to conceive what principle, exeept that of opposition to Lachm., indreced Tisch. to retain so very questionable a reading, and to reverse the judgment of his first edition.
nearly all mss.; Goth., al.], but in all probability is a correction.
 regat] Syriac, 'sit gubernatrix,' Beza. The verb $\beta \rho \alpha \beta \epsilon \dot{v} \epsilon \mathrm{~L}[\beta \rho \alpha=\pi \rho o$, see notes on Phil. iii. 14] has here received different explanations, 'exultet,' Vulg., Goth., 'stabiliatur,' Copt., Fthiop., 'abundet,' Clarom., all perhaps endeavoring to retain some shade of the original meaning
 od.), but obscuring rather than clucidating. The later and secondary meaning 'administrare:' 'gubernare,' Hesychius
 and Schweigh. Lex. Polyb. s. v.), seems here the most simple and natural; 'let the peace which comes from Christ order all things in your hearts.' For confirmation of this later meaning, see also the exx. collected by Krebs (Obs. p. 343), and Loesn. (Obs, p. 373), one of the most pertinent of which is Jos. Antiq. 1v. 3. 2,

 ${ }^{\epsilon} \rho \chi \in \tau \alpha l$ where the association with $\delta$ ot$\kappa \in i ̂ \sigma$ Nิat renders the meaning very distinct: On the use of rapoia to denote the subject in its inner relations, see Beck, Seelenl. IIr. 23, p. 80, compare p. 107.
 ' unto which [almost, for unto it (sce notes on ch. i. 25, 27)] ye were also called;' unto the enjoyment and participation of
which, the eis marking the immediate (not ultimate) object of the raneiv (1 Cor. i. 9, 1 Tim. vi. 12, compare notes), and thus differing but little from $\mathfrak{e} \pi \boldsymbol{\pi}$ with dat., by which Chrysost. here explains it. The latter perhaps involves more the idea of approximation (Donalds. Cratyl. § 172), the former of direction. The ascensive кal marks the $\kappa \lambda \hat{\eta} \sigma \iota s$ as also having the same object as the apostle's admonition. $\epsilon^{2} \nu$ £ $\left.\left.\nu\right\} \sigma \omega \dot{\omega} \alpha \tau \ell\right]$ 'in one body,' i.e. so as to abide in one body; not marking the object contemplated, 'ut unum essetis corpus' (comp. Grotius), nor the manner of the calling (Steig., compare 1 Cor. vii. 15), but, as the more concrete term seems to require, simply the result to which it tended;
 ท̂бal, Ecum. ; compare Eph. ii. 16, and Winer, Gr. § 50. 5, p. 370.
kal $\in \dot{\cup} \chi \alpha$ d $p . \gamma[\nu]$ 'and be (become) thankful,' scil. to God (Chrysost., Theophyl.) as $\delta \kappa \alpha \lambda \omega ิ \nu$ (see notes on Gal. i. 6), less probably to Christ, as Theod. and expressly Syr. and IEth. The meaning 'amabiles,' є̇̇ðápıтоь (Olshaus.), though lexically defensible (comp. Xen. Econ. v. 10), seems here wholly inappropriate. Eùxapırテía was a duty ever foremost in the thoughts of the great apostle, I Thess. v. 18; observe his frequent use of cỉ $\chi \alpha \rho เ \sigma \tau \epsilon i v \nu$ ( 25 times) and củ $\chi \alpha p t \sigma \tau i \alpha$ ( 12 times), the latter of which only occurs thrice elsewhere (Acts xxiv. 3, Rev.



17. 'Incoû X $\rho \iota \sigma \tau o v ̂]$ So Lachm., with ACD1F G; mss.; very many $\mathrm{VV}_{\mathrm{v}}$; some Ff. Rec., followed by Tisch, and Alf., reads Kupiou 'I $\eta \sigma o \hat{u}$ with BD³EK; great mass of mss.; Amit., Goth., Syr. (Philox.), al. ; Clem. (?), Theod., al., but appy. with less probability. By a comparison of the variations of this and the preceding verse with those of Eph. v. 19, 20 (Alf.'s remark that there are 'hardly any;' is scantly correct) we may form some interesting local comparisons. It will be seen that KI , present distinct traces of conformation, E less so, ADFG perhaps still less, and B scarcely any at all; C has a lacuna at Eph. l. c.
iv. 9, vii. 12) in the whole N. T. For a grood sermon on the whole of the verse, see Frank, Serm. Li. Vol. II. p. 394 (A.-C. Libr.).
16. $\delta$ र'f yos tô $\mathbb{X} \rho$.] 'the word of Christ,' as delivered in the Gospel, Xpıotoû being the genitive subjecti, the word spoken and proclaimed by Him, I Thessalon. i. 8, iv. 15, 2 Thessalon. iii. 1 ; compare Winer, G'r. § 30. 1, p. 158. It is perfectly unnecessary, with Lachm. (ed. stereot.), to enclose this clause in brackets. The previous more general exhortations to love and peace which conclude with $\epsilon_{u} \chi \chi$ áp. $\gamma^{i \nu \in \sigma \hat{N} \in \text { are }}$ suitably accompanicd by a more special one which shows the efficacy of the Gospol in such respects, and more fully expands the last precept; тapaıvéनas єùХapíซтous eival кal $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \delta \delta \delta \nu ~ \delta \in i ́ \kappa \nu \nu \sigma \iota$, Chrys.
 $\dot{v} \mu \hat{\iota} \nu, \pi \lambda$.] 'dwell within you richly;' surely not 'among you,' De W., which would tend to obliterate the force of the compound, nor 'in you as a Church,' Meyer, Alf., which really comes to the same thing, - but, as usual, 'within

 hearts,' the outcoming and manifestation of which was to be seen in the acts described by the participles. Comp. Rom. viii. 11, 2 Tim. i. 5, 14, the only other passages in St. Paul's Epistles (2 Cor. vi. 16 , is a quotation) in which èvouseiv
e่ $\nu$ vipiv occurs, and which, though the $\tau \delta$ évoukồv is different, go far to fix the meaning in the present case. The indwelling was to be $\pi$ rovoiws, 'richly,' ' not with a scanty foothold, but with a large and liberal occupancy,' Eadie.
$\epsilon^{2} \nu \pi \alpha \sigma \eta \sigma \circ \phi\{\dot{\alpha}$ is not to be connected with what precedes (Syr., - but apparently not Chrys., as asserted by Meyer, Alf.), but with what follows, as in ch. i. 28. The construction is then perfectly harmonious ; évoukeitc has its single adverb $\pi \lambda o v \sigma i \omega s$, and is supported and expanded by two co-ordinate participial clauses, each of which has its spiritual manner or element of action ( $\epsilon \nu \nu \pi \alpha, \sigma \eta$ $\sigma \circ \phi i ́ a, ~ \in ̇ \nu \nu$ रápıtı) more exactly defined; see notes on ch. i. 28.
 ing and admonishing one another:' on the meaning and force of $\nu 0 u \uparrow \uparrow \tau \epsilon \in \mathrm{i}$, see notes on ch. i. 28. On the possible force of éautous, see notes on ver. 13 : here it is more probably simply for $\dot{a} \lambda \lambda \hat{\eta} \lambda$ ous ; see Winer, Gr. § 22.5, p. 136. On the very intelligible participial anacoluthon, see Green, Gr. p. 313, notes on Eph. iii. 18, and on Phil. i. 30.
$\psi a \lambda \mu o i s$, v̈ $\mu \nu$ ots, k. т. $\lambda$.$] 'with$ psalms, hymns, spiritual songs ;' instrument by which, or rehicle in which (Mey.), the $\delta \iota o ̂ a \chi \grave{\eta}$ and עovs̀ér $\eta \sigma เ s$ were to be communicated. Mill and Tisch. connect these datives with the following words, but not with propriety, as ọ̆ $\delta o \nu \tau \epsilon s$,

##  

has already two defining members associated with it. On the distinction between the terms, and the force of $\pi \nu \in \nu$ $\mu a r$. ('such as the Holy Spirit inspircs '), see notes on the parallel passage, Eph. v. 19. Mcyer remarks that the singing, etc., here alluded to, was not necessarily at divine service, but at the ordinary social meetings; see Clem.-Alex. Pced. Ir. 4. 43, Vol. I. p. 194 (cd. Pott.), where this passage is referred to ; compare Suiccr, Thesaur. Vol. II. p. 1568. On the hymns used by the ancient church in her services, see Bingham, Antiq. xıv. 2. 1. The copula kal after $\psi a \lambda \mu o i s ~\left[\mathrm{C}^{2} \mathrm{D}^{2} \mathrm{D}^{3} \mathrm{E}\right.$ KL] and after $\ddot{v}^{\mu} \mu \nu o s s$ [ $\left.\Lambda \mathrm{C}^{3} \mathrm{D}^{3} \mathrm{EKL}\right]$ seems to have come from the sister passage, and is rightly rejected by Lachm., Tisch, and most modern editors.
 ing;' participial clause co-ordinate to the forecroing, specifying another form of singing, viz., that of the inward heart ; see Eph. v. 10, and notes in loc. 'Ev $\tau \hat{\eta}$ $\chi^{\alpha} \rho$. [Rec. omits $\tau \hat{\eta}$ with $\mathrm{AD}^{3} \mathrm{E}^{2} \mathrm{KL}$; al.] is obviously parallel to $\epsilon^{2} \nu \pi \alpha d^{\sigma} \eta$ ? $\sigma o-$ pia, and serves to define the characteristic clement to which the $\alpha \underset{\alpha}{\circ} \delta \epsilon t \nu$ was to be circumscribed (see notes on ch. i. 28) ; it was to be in the element, and with the accompaniment of Divine grace : so Chrys. 2, ảmঠ $\tau \hat{1} s$. $\chi$ д́pıтos тoû $\Pi \nu \in u ́ \mu a \tau o s$, Ecum., ठià rท̂s $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha ̀$ тov̂ árílou Пעev́paтos סoה̌eloŋs $\chi$ ápıros, both of which, however, are rather coarse paraphrases of the preposition. The interpretations 'quod se utilitate commendet,' Beza, ' with becoming thankfulness,' De Wette, etc., are unsatisfactory; and $\chi$ aptévicus, Grot., 'in dexteritate quâdam gratiosâ,' Davenant 2 , untenable, as the singing was not aloud, but in the silence of the heart (Mey.).
$\epsilon^{\epsilon} \nu \tau \alpha \hat{\imath} \mathrm{c} \kappa \alpha \rho \delta \mathrm{abs}$ v $\mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ ] 'in your hearts; ' locality of the

expansion of the preceding, defining its proper characteristics or accompaniments ( $\mu \grave{\eta} \mu \dot{\delta} \nu \dot{\nu} \nu \tau \hat{\varphi} \sigma \tau \delta \mu a \tau \iota$, Theod.) in which case the clause would be subordinate, - but specifies another kind of singing, viz., that of the inward heart to God, the former being éautoiss : see notes on Eph. v. 19. The reading Kupí [Rec. with C2D ${ }^{3}$ EKLL] scems clearly to have arisen from the parallel passage.
17. $\pi \hat{a} \nu$ \%̋ т $\left.\iota . . \frac{\xi}{\epsilon} \rho \gamma \omega\right]$ An absolute nom. standing out of regimen and placed at the beginning of the sentence with a slight emphatic force ; sce Jelf, Gr. § 477. 1. This seems slightly more correct than to regard it as an accusative reflected from the following $\pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \tau \tau \alpha$, as apparently Steiger and De Wette.
$\pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha$ is certainly not adverbial (Storr, compare Kypke, Obs. Vol. II. p. 329), nor even a resumption of the preceding $\pi \hat{\alpha} \nu$, but an accus. governed by $\pi o t \epsilon i ̂ \tau$, supplied from the preceding тоเทิтє; compare notes on Ephes. v. 22. What had been stated individually in $\pi a ̂ \nu 8 \tau t$ к. $\tau . \lambda$. is now expressed more fully and collectively by $\pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau a$. It is difficult to understand how the reverse can be the case (Eadie), and the plural 'individual-
 $\mathbf{X} \rho$.] 'in the name of Jesus Christ;' not 'invocato illius adjutorio,' Daven. ( $\kappa a \lambda \in i$ т $\grave{\nu}$ rióv, Chrys.), but, as in Eph. v. 20, 'in the name, in that holy and spiritual element which His name betokens;' see notes on Ephes. l. c., on Phil. ii. 10, and compare Barrow, Serm. xxxiri. 6, Vol. 11. p. 323, where every possible meaning is stated and exhausted; see also Whichcote, Disc. xurir. Vol. II. p. 288 sq. (Aberd. 1751), - one of a course of three valuable sermons on this text, and comp. Beveridge, Serm. crix. Vol. v. p. 116 sq. (A.-(.. Libr.).
$\epsilon \dot{\cup} \chi \propto \rho . \tau \hat{\varphi} \Theta \in \hat{\Psi} \kappa . \tau . \lambda$.$] 'giving thanks$

Wipes and husbands，clil－ dren and parents，observe your duties．Servants，obey your masters and be faithful ；masters，be just．
to God the Father through Him ；＇attend－ ant service with which the（ $\pi ⿰ 丿 ⿺ 丄 𠃍 \in \tilde{\tau} \tau \epsilon$ ）$\pi \alpha ́ v \tau \alpha$ к．т． ．is to be ever associated；comp．Eph． v．20，and sce notes on ver． 15 ，and on Plil．ive 6 ；add Hofmann，Schrifib．Vol． ri．2，p．336，who less probably limits the ej $\begin{aligned} & \text { Xap．to thankfulness for ability }\end{aligned}$ thus to do all ĕ $\nu \dot{\circ} \nu \delta \mu . \kappa . \tau . \lambda$ ．The read－ ing $\Theta_{\epsilon} \hat{\varphi} \kappa$ кal $\pi a \pi \rho!~(R c c) ~ i s ~ w e l l ~ s u p p o r t-$. ed［DEFGK；mss．；Vulg．，Clar．，al．］， but opposed to AC and B （an important wimess in these verses，see crit．note）； some mss．；Goth．，Copt．，Sah．，al．；Clem． and many Ff．；so also Lachm．and Tisch．

18．$a i \gamma \nu \nu a \hat{i} k \in s]$ This verse and the eight following（iii．18－iv．1）con－ tain special precepts，nearly the same as those in the latter part of ch．$v$ ．and the beginning of ch．vi．of the Epistle to the Ephesians．Such a similarity，often ex－ tending to words and phrases，is notice－ able，and not very easy to account for， except on the somewhat obvious suppo－ sition that social precepts of this nature addressed，in the first instance，to the Chirstians of Colossæ and Laodicea，were known and felt by the apostle to be equally necessary and applicable to the church of Ephesus and the Christians of Lydia．The exhortations in the past Epistles are urged under somewhat dif－ furent aspects．A comparison of the two Epistles will here be found very instruc－ tive ；it seems to lead to the opinion that the shorter Epistle was written first；com－ pare notes on Eph．vi．21．Alford in loc．seems of a contrary opiniou，but is in some degree at issue with his Prole－ gomena，p． $42 . \quad \dot{v} \pi$ oт. Toîs à $\nu \delta \rho$ ．］＇submit yourselves to your husbands ；＇see notes on Eph．v．22，where the same precept occurs nearly in the same language．The addition iotoos ［Rec．with L；many mss．；Vv．and Ff．］
is opposed to the authority of all the other uncial manuscripts．
$\dot{\omega} s \dot{\alpha} \nu \hat{\eta} k \in \nu]$＇as it became filling，＇＇as it should be，＇as was still more your duty when you entered upon your Christian profession．The imperf．not perf．，Huth．） is not for the present（compare Thom． M．s．v．，p．751，cd．Bern．），but，as the associated èv Kupíc still more clearly shows，has its proper force，and points to conditions that were simultaneous with their entrance into Christianity，but which were still not completcly fulfilled； sce Winer，Gr．$\$ 40.3$, p．242 and Bern－ hardy，Synt．x．3，p．373，add also Hero－ dian，s．v．，p． 468 （cd．Piers．），where in the similar forms $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \hat{\eta} \kappa \epsilon$ ，＇้ $\chi \rho \eta \nu$ ，єै $\delta \in \iota$ ， the tense is properly recognized．Ou the frequently recurring ėv Kupicu，here to be connected with à $\nu \hat{\jmath} \kappa \epsilon \nu$（compare ver．20），not with úmorá $\sigma \sigma$ ．（Chrysost．， Theoph．），see notes on Eph．iv．16，vi．1， Phil．ii．19，al．

19．oi $\ddot{\alpha} \nu \delta \rho \in s$ к．т．$\lambda$ ．］Repeated in Epl2．v．25，but there enhanced by a comparison of the holy bond between Christ and His Church．The encyclical letter enters into greater and deeper re－ lations．$\quad \mu \grave{\eta} \pi \iota \kappa \rho a i ́-$ $\nu \in \sigma \geqslant \in]$＇do not be embittered ；＇compare Eph．iv．31．The verb occurs in its simple sense，Rev．viii．11，x．9，10；here in its metaphorical sense，as occasionally both in classical（e．g．Plato，Legg．V．p． 731 D ，associated with аेкрахолєiv，［De－ mosth．］Epist．p．1464，joined with $\mu \nu \eta$－ бькакєiv），and post－classical，writers，e．g．
 comp．Joseph．Antiq．v．7．1，е̇тıкрaıעठ＇ $\mu \in \nu o s \pi \rho \partial s$ aủzoús．The form is appar－ ently pass．with a middle force（＇medial－ pass．，＇Krüger）；compare Theocr．Idyll． V．120，and Schol．in loc．，тıкраívetal $\lambda u \pi \epsilon i t a l$, and sce Krüger，Sprachl．ई 52.

тàs quvaîкаs киi $\mu \grave{\eta}$ тикраìveбશє $\pi$ pòs aủtás. ${ }^{20}$ Tà тéкva vima-


20. є̉̉d́pe $\sigma \tau \dot{\partial} \nu$ ė $\sigma \tau \iota \nu$ ] So Tisch. (ed. 1), Lachm., Alf., al., with ABCDE; 3 mss. (Vv. in such cases are hardly to be relied on). Tisch. (ed. 2, 7) adopts the reversed order with FGKL; and great majority of mss., - apparently very insufficient authority.
6. 1, where a large list of such verbs is given, with examples. On the derivation of $\pi$ uıpós [from a root пाK- 'pierced'], see Buttmann, Lexil. § 56, comp. Donalds. Cratyl. § 266.
20. $\dot{\text { itaк. тоîs } \gamma о \nu . \kappa \text { к. т. ג.] 'be }}$ obedient to your parents in all things;' comp. Eph. vi. 1. There the exhortation is accompanied with a speciul ref. to the fifth commandment; here that reference is applied only, and involved in the argumentative clause. The comprehensive $\tau \alpha ̀ ~ \pi \alpha ́ v \tau a$ is obviously to be regarded as the general rule; excep-

 would be easily recoguized; the great apostle was ever more occupied with the rule than with the exceptions to it. On the exceptions in the present case, see Bp. Taylor, Duct. Dub. xir. 5, Rule 1. and 4 sq . The form ט́такоvect, if not stronger than $\dot{\text { íтотабб. ( }} \mathrm{De}$ W.), has a more inclusive aspect as implying ' dicto obtemperare,' - not merely sulbmission to authority, but obedience to a command; see Tittmann, Synon, I. p. 193. тоиิто $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho \kappa$ к. т. $\lambda$.] 'forthis is wellpleasing in the Lord;' obviously not 'to the Lord ' (Copt., perhaps following a different reading), ${ }^{\epsilon} \nu$ not being a 'nota dat.,' nor even 'coram' 30 Syriac, ' apud,' Wth. (Pol.), but, as in ver. 18 and elsewhere, 'in Domino,' Vulg., Clarom., Goth., the prep. defining the sphere in which the $\tau \delta \in \dot{J} \dot{\alpha} \rho \in \sigma \tau 0 \nu$ was especially felt and evinced to be so. The reading
of Rec., Tê Kupi $\omega$, has not the support of any uncial MS., and is rejected by all modern editors.
21. $\mu$ 方 '́ $\rho \in \mathfrak{N}$ 亿 $\zeta \in \tau \in]$ 'do not irritate;' duty of fathers, expressed on the negative side ; compare Eph. vi. 4. The command there is $\mu \eta$ r $\pi \alpha \rho o \rho \gamma i \zeta \epsilon \tau \epsilon$, between which and the present the difference is perhaps scarcely appreciable. The former verb perhaps points to provocation to a deeper feeling, the latter ('irritare') to one more partial and transitury. The
 perfectly certain, it is commonly referred to ${ }^{\rho} \rho$ เs [Lobeck, Pathol. p. 438; Benfey, Wurzellex. Vol. I. p. 102], $\mu$ ो фьлауєıкоtє́pous aủroùs moteîte, Chrysost., - but comp. Pott, Et. Forsch. Vol. II. p. 162, and Benfey, Wurzellex. Vol. II. p. 340. Lachmann here, according to his principles, reads mapopri $\zeta \epsilon \tau \epsilon$ with $\mathrm{ACD}^{1} \mathrm{E}^{1} \mathrm{~F}$ GL ; al. Though well supported, it can scarcely be doubted that it is a conformation to Ephes. l. c.
Iva $\mu \grave{\eta} \dot{\alpha} \boldsymbol{\alpha} v \mu$.] ' in order that they may not be disheartened,' that they may not have a broken spirit and pass into apathy and desperation, by secing their parents so harsh and difficult to please; compare Corn. a Lap. in loc. The verb $\dot{\alpha} \hat{\partial} v \mu \in i \nu$ is an $\ddot{\alpha} \pi$. $\lambda \in \gamma o ́ \mu$. in the N. T., but sufficiently common both in the LXX. (1 Sam. i. 7, xv. 11), and elsewhere ; see examples in Wetst., who cites a pertinent passage from Neneas Tact. [ap. Fabric. III. 30.10], Poliorcet.






22．oi $\delta 0 \hat{v} \lambda o 九$ ］Duties of slaves， more fully detailed，yet closely sin．，both in arguments and language，in the paral－ lel passage in Eph．vi． 5 sq．，where see notes．On the general drift and object of these frequently recurring exhorta－ tions to slaves，see note on 1 Tim．vi． 1 sq．$\quad \tau$ о̂̀s кат $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \alpha \rho \kappa \alpha$ $\kappa v \rho$.$] ＇your masters according to the flesh ；＇$ your bodily，earthly masters；you have another Master in heaven：＇oi kazd̀ $\sigma a ́ p-$ ка кúp．tacite distinguuntur a Christo，＇ Fritz．Rom．Vol．11．p．270．There is apparently no consolatory force in the
 Theoph．；sim．Theod．，（Ecum．）；see notes on Eph．l．c．On the neglected distinction between кúpıos and $\delta \in \sigma \pi o ́ т \eta s$ ， sce Trench，Synon．§ 28，comp．Ammon． Diff．Voc．p． 39 （ed．Valck．）．

 vi． 6 ；the primary reference to the mas－ ter＇s eye（Sanders．Serm．vir．67，ad Pop．），passes into the secondary ref．to falsehearted and hypocritical service gen－ erally．For examples of this use of the plural，compare James ii． $1, \dot{\epsilon} \nu \pi p o \sigma \omega \pi o-$ $\lambda \eta \psi i$ iass，and the long list in Gal．v．20， where see notes and grammatical refer－ ences．Lachm．here reads ỏ $\phi \geqslant a \lambda \mu o \delta o v-$ $\lambda$ eía with ABDEFG； 6 mss ．；Dain．， Theoph．，Chrysost．（varies）：in spite of this preponderance of uncial authority we seem justified on critical principles in re－ taining with CKL ；great mass of mss．； Clem．，Theod．，EEcumen．（Rec．，Tisch．）， －the plural，which，even independently of the parallel passage，was so likely to be changed to a reading supposed to be more in harmony with the $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \dot{\alpha} \pi \lambda \lambda \dot{T} \eta \eta_{t}$ карঠ́ias in the correlative member which follows．
$\hat{\epsilon}^{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}} \boldsymbol{\nu} \dot{\alpha} \pi \lambda \delta \boldsymbol{\tau} . \kappa \alpha \rho-$ $\delta\{a s$ ］＇in singleness of heart，＇in freedom
from all dishonesty，duplicity，and false show of industry ；see Eph．vi．5，where the meaning is slightly more limited by the preceding clause $\mu \in \tau \alpha ̀$ фóßou ка⿱亠乂 т $\rho \delta$ б－ $\mu o v$ ．On the scriptural meaning and ap－ plication of＇doubleness of heart＇，sec Beck，Seelenl．111．26，p．106．Here，as Meyer observes，$\dot{\epsilon} \nu \dot{\alpha} \pi \lambda \boldsymbol{\sigma} \sigma$ ．in the nega－ tive clause answers to $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \dot{\prime} \phi \hat{\wedge} a \lambda \mu o \delta$ ：iu the positive，and the following $\phi \circ \beta$ oú $\mu$ ． $\tau \delta \nu$ Kúp．to $\omega s$ à $\nu \uparrow \rho \omega \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \rho \in \sigma \kappa \circ$ ．The read－ ing is again sliyhtly doubtful．Rec．has $\Theta \in \delta \nu$ ，with $\mathrm{D}^{3} \mathrm{E}^{2} \mathrm{IK}$ ；mss．；Lachm．and Tisch．adopt Kúpıov，with ABCD1E1F GL, －which is certainly to be preferred， as there seems nothing in Eph．l．c．to which it could be a conformation．

23．$\hat{\delta}$ Eُ $\grave{\alpha} \nu \pi 0 \iota \hat{\eta} \tau \epsilon]$ More specific explanation and expansion of the pre－ ceding positive exhortations．Again， there is a difference of reading ；that of the text is found in $\triangle B C D^{1} F G$ ，and adopted by Lachin．and Tisch．The Rec．kal $\pi \hat{\alpha} \nu$ \％$\tau \iota{ }^{\text {ca}}$ d $\nu$ is feebly supported ［ $\mathrm{D}^{2} \mathrm{D}^{3} \mathrm{EKI} \mathrm{L}_{2}$ ］，and possibly a reminis－ cence of ver．17．Alford prefixes kal， apparently by an oversight．
$\vec{\epsilon} \kappa \psi \cup \chi \hat{\eta} s]$＇from the heart（soul）；＇ stronger than $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \dot{\alpha} \pi \lambda \delta \dot{\sigma}$ ．кар $\delta$ ．above，scil． दُ $\epsilon$ є̇voías кaì ö öך סv́vauls，CEcum．，and as opposed to any outward constraint， Delitzsch，Psychol．Iv．7，p． 162 ：comp． on Eph．vi．7．$\hat{\omega} s \tau \hat{\omega} \mathrm{~K} v \rho$ ． к．r．$\lambda$ ．］＇as to the Lord and not to men；＇ dat．of＇interest，＇Krüger，Sprachl．§ 48 ． 4．The $\dot{\omega}$ s serves to mark the mode in which，or the aspects under which，the service was to be viewed；see Bernhar－ dy，Synt．vir．1，p．333，Fritz．Rom． Vol．II．p．360，and notes on Eph．v．22， where this interpretation of $\dot{\omega}$ is more fully investigated．It is objected to by Eadie（on Col．p．258），but apparently without full reason，being grammatically




exact and apparently exegetically satisfactory. The negative ouk, as usually in such opposite members, is absolute and objective; they were to work as workers to the Lord and non-workers to men ; they were not to serve two masters (Mcy.) ; comp. Wincr, Gr. § 55. 1, p. 422, Green, Gr. p. 121 sq.
24. $\operatorname{i} \delta \delta \dot{\delta} \tau \in s$ ] 'seeing ye know:' causal participle, giving the reason for the preceding command ; compare ch. iv. I, and the parallel passage, Eph. vi. 8.
$\dot{\alpha} \pi \delta \mathrm{K} v \rho[\mathrm{ov}]$ 'from the Lord,' not perfectly identical with тapà Kupíou Eph. vi. 8, but, with the proper force of the prep., expressive of procedure from, as from the more remote object : see Winer, Gr 47. b, p. 326, and notes on Gal. i. 11. The remark of Eadie that $\alpha \pi \delta$ marks that the gift ' comes immediately from Clirist,' is thus wholly untenable. In тарà (more usual in personal relations) the primary idea of simple motion from the subject passes into the more usual one of motion from the immediate neighborhood of the object; see Donalds. Crat. § 177, Winer, l.c., p. $327 . \quad \tau \dot{\eta} \nu \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \alpha \pi . \tau \hat{\eta} s$ $\kappa \lambda \eta \rho$.] 'the recompense of the inheritance,' i. e. the recompense which is the inheritance, $\tau \hat{\eta} s \kappa \lambda \eta \rho o \nu$. being the gen. of identity or apposition, Scheuerl. Synt. §12. 1, pp. 82, 85, Wi. Gr. §59.8. a, p. 470. This $\kappa \lambda \eta \rho \frac{\nu}{} \mu i \alpha$ is obviously the $\kappa \lambda \eta \rho о \nu$. ( $\epsilon \nu$
 which was reserved for them hereafter; compare 1 Pet. i. 4, and on the meaning of the term, Reuss, Theol. Chret. iv. 22, Vol. II. p. 249. The double compound $\dot{\alpha} \nu \tau a \pi \delta \delta o \sigma \iota s$ in an $\dot{\alpha} \pi$. $\lambda \in \gamma \delta \mu$. in the N. T., but not uncommon elsewhere (Isa. lxi. 2, Hosea ix. 7, Polyb. Hist. vi. 5. 3, and with a local reference, IV. 43.5 , al.) : the verb is found several times in the
N. T., and the pass. compound, à $\nu t a \pi o ́-$ $\delta \rho \mu a$, twice, Luke xiv. 12, Rom. xi. 9 (quotation). The gloss $\mu$ ronatoסoбian only occurs in cursive mss.
$\tau \hat{\omega} \mathrm{K} v \rho, \mathrm{X} \rho . \delta o v \lambda$.] 'serve ye the Lord Christ :' brief yet comprehensive statement of the duty of $\delta o \hat{u} \lambda o l$, regarded in
 rots, ver. 23. So distinctly, imperative, Vulg., Copt. (ari-bōl), Rth. (Pol. ; mistranslated) ; Claromanus less probably adopts the present. The reading is scarcely doubtful: Rec. inserts $\gamma$ àp with $\mathrm{D}^{2} \mathrm{D}^{3}(\mathrm{E}$ ? $) \mathrm{KL}$; Syriac (both), Athiopic (Platt), Goth., al., but with very little probability, being weaker than the text in uncial authority $\left[\mathrm{ABC}^{1} \mathrm{C}^{2} \mathrm{D}^{1} \mathrm{E}\right]$, and suspicious as helping out the seeming want of connection.
25. $\delta \gamma \grave{\alpha} \rho$ d̉ $\delta \iota \kappa \hat{\omega} \nu]$ 'for the wrongdoer.' It is slightly doubtful whether $\delta$ á $\delta \leqslant \kappa \omega ิ \nu$ refers to the master (Theod.), to the slaves (Theoph.), or, more comprehensively, to both (Huther). The prevailing meaning of $\dot{\alpha} \delta a k \in i \nu$ in the N . T. ('injuriam facere,' Vulg. ; except Rev. xxii. 11, but surely not Philem. 18, as Eadie), and still more the succeeding clause, ov̀k eै $\sigma \tau เ \nu \pi \rho o \sigma \omega \pi$., scem decidedly in favor of the former; so that the verse must be regarded as supplying en. couragement and consolation to slaves when suffering oppression or injustice at the hands of their masters ; $\ddot{\sigma} \tau \epsilon \phi \eta \sigma$ i, $\kappa \stackrel{a}{\alpha} \nu \mu \eta$ тúX $\eta \tau \epsilon \dot{\alpha} \gamma a \hat{\omega} \omega \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau i o ̂ \partial \sigma \sigma \epsilon \omega \nu$ тарळे

 ठוкаíaע єíซфє́ $\rho \in \iota ~ \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \psi \eta \bar{\eta} \phi o \nu$, Theod.
$\kappa 0 \mu i \sigma \in \tau \alpha /]$. 'slall receive back,' as it were a deposit: not so much a brachy$\log y$ as a pregnant statement, 'he shall receive back $\delta$ 方 $\delta i \kappa \eta \sigma \sigma$ in the form of just retribution,' Winer; Gram. §66. 1. b, p.
IV. Oí кúpıot, тò סikatov каì тìv i大ótךтa тoîs סoúhots $\pi a-$


Pray for us and for our success in the Gospel. Walk wisely, speak to the point, and be ready to auswer them that ask.
547. The future refers to the day of final retribution ; see on Eph. vi. 8.
$\pi \rho \circ \sigma \omega \pi \circ \lambda \eta \mu \psi\{a]$ 'respect of persons ;' see notes on Gal. ii. 6, and on the (Alexandrian) insertion of $\mu$, Tisch. Prolegom. p. xlvi. sq. (ed. 7). In the parallel passage, Eph. vi. 9, тapà aủrê (Rom. ii. 11. ix. 14) is added [FG $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha े \tau \hat{\varphi} \Theta \epsilon \hat{\omega}]$, in which case the prep. has its prevailing idea of closeness to (comp. on ver. 24), and marks the ethical presence with the object (Latin in) of the quality alluded to ; comp. Matt. Gr. § 588. b.

Cimapter IV. 1. oi kúplot] The duties of masters are enunciated on the positive side; in the parallel passage,
 $\alpha \dot{a} \pi \epsilon \lambda \eta \eta^{\prime} \nu$, defines also the negative side. $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ í $\sigma$ ó $\eta \tau \alpha$ ] 'equity.' The association of this word with $\tau \delta$ dikatoy and the undoubted occurrence of it in a similar sense elsewhere (see Philo, de Just. §4, Vol. in. p. 363 (ed. Mang.), and esp. § 14, ib. p. 374 , where it is termed the $\mu \eta$ ŋ́т $\rho \eta$ סเкato $\begin{gathered}\text { úvクs) seem fully to justify }\end{gathered}$ the more derivative meaning adopted above: so Syr., Vulg., Ath. (Pol.), apparently Copt., and distinetly Chrysost, and the Greek commentators; iбóтทтa
 Theod. : so De W., Neander (Planting, Vol. I. p. 488), Alf., and the majority of modern expositors. Meyer, and after him Eadie (with modifications), contend for the more literal meaning 'equality' (2 Cor, viii. 13, 14, compare Job xxxvi. 29), i.e. the equality of condition in spiritual matters which Christianity brought with it ; compare Philem. I6: so perhaps Goth. Ïbnassu [similitudinem;
cognate with 'even']. This is ingenious and plausible, but, on account of the association with $\tau \grave{\text { óikalov, not satisfactory. }}$ In such a case we may with some profit refer to the ancient Vv, and Greck commentators.
$\pi \alpha \rho \in ́ \chi \in \sigma \hat{\imath} \epsilon]$ 'supply on your side ;' middle, $\Lambda$ cts xix. 24 , Tit. ii. 7 ; active elsewhere in the N. T. In this form of the middle roice, called the 'dynamic' (Krüger, Sprachl. § 52. 8), or 'intensive' middle, the reference to the powers put forth by the subject is more distinct than in the active, which simply states the action; compare Donalds. Gram. § 432. 2. $b_{4}$. Such delicate shades of meaning can scarcely be expressed in translation, but no less exist ; see especially Krüger, l.c., where this verb is particularly noticed, and Kuster, de Verb. Med. § 49. The difference appears to have been partially appreciated by Ammonius, in his too narrow distinction,. $\pi a p \in ́ \chi \in \iota \nu \mu$ èv $\lambda \in ́ \gamma \in \tau a l$

 єथ̈votav [but sec Acts xxviii. 2, al.], de Diff. Voc. p. 108 (ed. Valck.)
єi̊ót $\begin{gathered}\text { к. т. } \lambda \text {.]. 'seeing ye know that }\end{gathered}$ ye also;' causal participle, as in chapter iii. 24. The ascensive кal hints that masters and slaves stand really in like conditions of dependence; $\ddot{\omega} \pi \pi \epsilon \rho$ è $\kappa \in i ̂ \nu o u$
 oph. The reading in the last word of the verse is not quite certain: Rec, with good uncial authority [DEFGKL] reads oúpavois, but not without suspicion, on account of the parallel passage, Eph. vi. 9. The singular is found in ABC ; al. (Lachm., Tisch.).
2. $\tau \hat{\eta} \pi \rho \circ \sigma \in v \chi \hat{\eta} \pi \rho \circ \sigma \kappa$.] 'con-

## 

tinue instant in your prayer ;' Rom. xii. 12, Acts i. 14. The verb $\pi \rho о \sigma к а \rho т є \rho \epsilon i ̀ ~$ occurs several times in the N. T., and in the majority of cases, as here, with a dat., in which combination it appears to denote an earnest adherence and attention whether to a person (Acts viii. 13) or to
 tivos ėmitóvov, Chrys. It is found in the LXX. (Num. xiii. 20, absolutely), and in Polyb. (Hist. 1. 55. 4, I. 59. 12, al.) both absolutely and with a dative rei or personce.
 watcliful in it ;' modal clause to $\pi \rho o \sigma-$ картереiv: they were not to be dull and heavy in this great duty, but wakeful and active; compare Eph. vi. 18, 1 Pct. iv. 7. ' $\mathrm{E} \nu$ is here not instrumental (De Wette), but, as usual, denotes the sphere in which the wakefulness and alacrity was to be evinced.
$\dot{\epsilon} \nu \in \dot{U} \chi \propto \rho \iota \sigma \tau i a]$ 'with thanksgiving.' This clause is not to be connected with the finite verb, but with the participle, ind, as in Eph. vi. 18 (see notes), specimes the peculiar accompaniment, or concomitant act with which $\dot{\eta} \pi p o \sigma$. was to be associated; тouté $\sigma \tau \iota \mu \in \tau \alpha ̀$ є $\cup \chi a p \iota \sigma \tau i ́ a s$ тaút $\eta \nu$ тooồvtes, Theophil. This not uncommon use of $\epsilon^{\epsilon} \nu$ in the N. T. ( $\epsilon^{2} \nu$ adjunctive) to denote an attendant act, element, or circumstance, has scarcely received from Winer ( $G r . \$ 48, \mathrm{a}, \mathrm{p} .344$ ) the notice it deserves ; see notes on ch. ii. 7, on Eph. v. 26, and Green, Gr. p. 289. On the duty of euxapıotía see notes on ch. iii. 15, and on Phil. iv. 6.
3. $\kappa \alpha\} \pi \in \rho\} \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu]$ 'for us also;' scil. for the apostle and Timothy, not for the apostle alone (Chrys., Theophil.) : the change to the singular in the last clause of the verse ( $\delta \epsilon \delta \epsilon \mu \alpha \iota$ ) would otherwise seem pointless; see notes on ch. i. 3. On the almost interchangeable meanings of $\pi \in \rho$ l and $\dot{v} \pi \epsilon \rho$ in this and similar
formulæ, see notes on Phil. i. 7, and on Eph. vi. 19.

І $\boldsymbol{\nu} \boldsymbol{\alpha}$ к. т. $\lambda$.]
Subject of the prayer blended with the purpose of making it: use of iva in reference to secondary purpose ; see notes on Phil. i. 9, and on Eph. i. 17.
$\dot{\alpha} \nu o[\xi \eta \eta \quad \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\imath} \nu \kappa . \tau . \lambda$.$] 'may open to$ $u s$ a door of the word;' i. e. may remove any obstacle to the preaching of the gospel. The 2 vipa is thus not exactly efooסos каl тар’pクбía (Chrys., CEcum.), but involves a figurative representation of obstructions and impediments that barred the way to preaching the Gospel, which were removed when the $\neg v \rho \rho a$ was opened; compare Acts xiv. 27, 1 Cor. xvi. 9, 2 Cor. ii. 12, Suicer, Thesaur. Vol. I. p. 1415, and examples in Wetstein on 1 Cor.l.c. $\lambda a \lambda \hat{\eta} \sigma \alpha l]$ Infin. of purpose and intention; see notes on ch. i. 23 , where this construction is discussed. On the meaning and derivation of $\lambda \alpha \lambda \epsilon \hat{\omega} \nu$ 'vocem ore emittere,' see notes on Tit. ii. 1, and on the distinction


 distinction, however, which cannot always be maintained in the N. Test., see Ammonius, Diff. Voc. p. 87 (ed. Valck.). $\mu \nu \sigma \tau \eta \rho<o \nu \tau 0 \hat{v} \mathrm{X} \rho$.] 'the mystery of Christ ;' not ' the mystery relating to Christ,' gen. objecti (De W., comp. Eph. i. 9), but gen. subjecti, 'the mystery of which He is the sum and substance;' see notes on Eph. iii. 4, and compare on Col. ii. 2. On the meaning of $\mu \nu \sigma \tau$ भिptov, see on Ephes. v. 32, and Reuss, Theol. Chrét. Iv. 9, Vol. II. p. 89.
$\delta i \delta$ каi $\delta \epsilon \in \epsilon \mu \alpha i]$ 'for which $I$ have also been bound;' 'which I have preached even $\mu \in ́ \chi \rho \rho \iota \delta \epsilon \sigma \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ ' (2 Tim. ii. 9 ), the ascensive kal marking the cxtreme to which he had procecded in his evangelical labors : he had endured privations and sufferings, and now beside


that, bonds. The perf. $\delta \in \delta \delta \epsilon \mu a t$ ('I have been and am bound') seems clearly to evince that the apostle was now in captivity: that this was at Rome, not at Cæsarea (Mey., Einl. p. 5), is satisfactorily shown by Alford, Prolegom. p. 20 sq. compared with p. 39. The reading $\delta \iota^{3} \delta \nu \nu$, adopted by Lachm. with BFG; Boern., has not sufficient external support.
4. I $\nu \alpha \phi \alpha \nu \in \rho \omega \sigma \omega$ ] 'in order that I may make it manifest.' It is somewhat doubtful whether this clause depends ( $c$ ) on $\delta \in \delta \delta \epsilon \mu a l$, Chrys., Beng., al. ; compare Phil. i. 12, 2 Tim. ii. 9 ; (b) on $\pi \rho o \sigma \in v-$ $\chi$ $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mu \in \nu o \iota, ~ D e ~ W ., ~ B a u m g .-C r u s ., ~ a l . ; ~(c) ~}^{\text {( }}$ on the preceding infinitival clause of purpose, $\lambda a \lambda \hat{\eta} \sigma \alpha \iota ~ \tau \delta ~ \mu \nu \sigma \tau \eta ́ p t o v, ~ v e r . ~ 3, ~ M e y ., ~$ al., or more generally, on the whole purpose involved in the verse, viz. unobstructed, unhindered speaking. Of these (a) involves a paradoxical assertion, which here, without any further explanation or expansion, seems somewhat $\dot{\alpha} \pi-$ poroórıтov and out of place: (b) impairs the continuity of the sentence, and puts a prayer which thus taken per se would naturally be referred to subjunctive capabilities in somewhat awkward parallelism with one which refers to the removal of objective hinderances: (c) on the contrary, keeps up the continuity, and carries out with proper modal additions ( $\dot{\omega} \delta \delta \in \hat{\imath} \mu \in \lambda a \lambda \hat{\eta} \sigma \alpha \iota$ ) the $\lambda a \lambda \hat{\eta} \sigma \alpha \iota$ which was the object involved in the

 $\tau 0 \hat{\text {, }}$, Theoph.
$\dot{\omega} S \delta \in \hat{\imath} \mu \epsilon$
$\lambda \alpha \lambda \hat{\eta} \sigma a t]$ 'as $I$ ought to speak;' so, but with a slightly different reference, Eph. vi. 20. This was not to be $\mu \in \tau \alpha$
 $\lambda \alpha \mu_{\mu} \in \nu=\nu$ (Chrys.) while in prison (which is apparently the sentiment mainly conveyed in Eph. l. c.), nor with any sub-
jective reference to his inward duty ( Da venant, Hammond), but, as the previous ă $\nu 0$ !' $\ddagger \eta$ Núpay seems to suggest, simply and objectively, 'as I ought to do it (scil. freely and unrestrainedly), so as best to advance and further the gospel.' While
 aùrò $\lambda a \lambda \hat{\eta} \sigma a l$; see Mcyer in loc. Eadic unites both the subjective and objective reference : the phrase is confessedly general, still the context seems to point, mainly and principally, if not exclusively, to the latter. In Eph. l.c., on the contrary, though the language is so very similar, the reference in both members seems to have more of a subjective character, and the construction in consequence to be slightly different.
5. $\epsilon \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \nu \sigma \circ \phi\left\{\alpha\right.$ 〕' in wisdom; ${ }^{3}$ element and sphere in which they were to walk, Winer, Gr. § 48. a, p. 346 : $\mu \eta \delta \epsilon \mu i a \nu$

 Theod. On the meaning of ooфía, not merely 'prudence,' but practical Christian wisdom,- compare notes on "clı. i. 9, and on Eph. i. 8.
mpos $\tau 0$ v̀s $\notin \xi \omega]$ 'toward them that are without,' тò̀s $\mu \eta \delta \epsilon ́ \pi \pi \omega \pi \epsilon \pi \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon \cup \kappa \delta ́ \tau a s$. Theod. ; the regular designation of all who were not Christians, 1 Cor. v. 12, 13, 1 Thessal. iv. 12 ; see Kypke, Ols. Vol. II. p. 198, and notes on 1 Tim. iii. 7. The prep. $\pi \rho o ́ s$, both here and 1 Thess. l.c., marks the social relation (Mey.) in which they were to stand with of $\epsilon \xi \omega$, the proper meaning of 'ethical direction toward ' (Winer, Gr. § $49 . \mathrm{h}, \mathrm{p} .360$ ) being still distinctly apparent. For examples of this use of $\pi \rho o s$, see Bernhardy, Synt. v. 31, p. 265, Rost u. Palm, Lex. s. v. 1. 2, Vol. II. p. 1157, where this prep. is extremely well discussed.
$\tau \delta \nu \kappa \alpha \iota \rho \delta \nu \quad$ ' $\xi a \gamma$.] 'buying up for yourselves the (fitting) season:' see on Eph.



You will learn my state and all matters here from Tychicus and Onesimus．


v．16，where this formula is investigated at length．The exhortation in this verse is extremely similar to that in Ephes．v． 15,16 ，except only that the precepts ex－ pressed there in a negative，are here ex－ pressed in a positive form．The reason for the present clause is there specifically noticed，öть ai тiцuépaı тоעпраí єiotv：here nothing more is stated than a general precept（ $\epsilon \eta$ бофía $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \pi \alpha \tau \epsilon i \tau \epsilon$ ）with an adjoined notice of the manner in which it was to be carried out：they were to make their own every season for walking in wisdom，and to avail themselves of every opportunity of obeying the com－ mand．

6．$\delta$＇$\quad$ रुos $\dot{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu]$＇your speech，＇ not only generally，but，as the close of the verse shows，more especially $\pi \rho$ oोs
 ＇with grace；＇scil．モै $\sigma \tau \omega$ ：$\chi$ d́pıs was to be the element in which，or perhaps the garb with which，the $\lambda$ doos was to be in－ vested；$\chi$ ápis was to，be the＇habitus orationis ；＇compare notes on 1 Tim．i． 18．$\ddot{\alpha} \lambda \alpha \tau t \dot{\eta} \rho \tau \nu \mu$ ．］＇sea－ soned with salt；＇further specification． Their discourse was not to be profitless and insipid，but，as food is seasoned with salt to make it agreeable to the pal－ ate，so was it to have a wholesome point and pertinency which might commend itself to，and tend to the edification of the hearers；see Suicer，Thesaur．s．v．＇ Vol．II．p．181．An indirect caution and antithetical reference to $\lambda$ d́oos $\sigma \alpha$－ л $\boldsymbol{\rho} \mathrm{o}^{\prime}$（＇ne quid putridi subsit，＇Bengel， compare Chrys．）is plausible（compare Eph．iv． 29 sq．），but not in accordance with т̂̂s $\delta \in \hat{\imath}$ ảтокрi $\nu \in \sigma \hat{\imath} \alpha \iota$ ，which points to $\lambda$ dóos under forms in which $\sigma a \pi \rho o ́ \tau \eta s$ could scarcely have been intruded．The
later classical use of ä $\lambda s$ ，＇sal，sales，sa－ linæ，＇seems here out of place．On the later form á $\lambda a s$ ，see Buttm．Gir．Vol．i． p． $227 . \quad \in i \delta$ é $\nu$ al］＇to linow，＇ i．e．＇so that you may know；＇loosely appended infinitive expressive of conse－ quence ；compare Madvig，Gram．§ 143， rem．For examples of this＇infin．epex－ egeticus，＇which is more usually found in clauses expressive of purpose or inten－ tion（see on ch．i．22），but is also found in laxer combinations（Acts xv．10，Heb． v．5），see Winer，Gr．§ 44.1 ，p． 284.
$\pi \hat{\omega} s \delta \in \hat{\iota}$ えे $\pi$ okp．］＇how you ought to return answer；＇the $\pi \hat{\omega} s$ embracing all the various forms of answer which the occasion might require．The apostle further adds，not without significance，$\in v l$ Éкáбтఱ；cach individual，whether put－ ting his questions from malice or igno－ rance，sincerity or insincerity，was sepa－ rately to receive the appropriate answer to his inquiry ；compare 1 Peter iii． 15. The context，as Meyer observes，seems to limit the present reference to the inter－ course of Christians with non－Christians， though the command has obviously an universal application：Chrysost．notices the case of the apostle at Athens；Mey． adds to this his answer before Felix， Festus，and the Jews at Rome．

7．$\tau \grave{\alpha} \kappa \alpha \tau^{\prime}$＇̇ $\mu \epsilon$ 」＇＇my condition，＇＇$m y$ circumstances，＇＇res meas，＇Beza ：on this formula see reff．on Eph．vi．21，and on the force of kard in this collocation， notes on Phil．i． 12.
Tv́ $\chi$ ！ios］not Tuxurós，Mill，Griesb．； an Aalavós，mentioned Acts xx．4，Eph． vi．21， 2 Tim．iv．12，Tit．iii． 12 ；see on Eph．l．c．His name is here associated with three titles of esteem and affection； he is an á $\gamma a \pi \eta \tau \delta \dot{\alpha} \dot{\alpha} \delta \in \lambda \phi \dot{\delta}$ in reference to


 íцì $\gamma \nu \omega \rho \iota o \hat{\sigma} \sigma \iota \nu \tau a ̀ ̀ ~ \hat{\omega} \delta \epsilon$.
the Christian community, a atซ $\begin{aligned} & \text { ds } \delta \text { odáco- }\end{aligned}$ vos in reference to his missionary services to St. Paul (not in the miaistry general(y, Alford), and further, with a graceful allusion to similarity of duties, a $\sigma$ fivõov$\lambda o s \in{ }^{\epsilon} \nu$ K $\nu \rho!(\omega$, a co-operator with, and coadjutor of, the apostle in the service of the same Master ; compare notes on Eph. vi. 21 .
$\epsilon_{\epsilon} \nu \mathrm{K} v \rho i \omega$ may be associated with all three designations ;De W., compare Eph.l.c.), or with the last two (Meycr), or with oúvôounos Jth.-Pol., and perhaps Syr.). As the two iormer have defining epithets, perhaps the last connection is slightly the most probable.
8. $\epsilon$ is aùvo toûto] 'for this very purpose,' viz. as further defined and expanded in the following clause, ' that he should gain a knowledge of your state, and comfort you.' On the reference of aủt тoûto to what follows, comp. Eph. vi. 22, Phil. i. 6, and notes in loc. The reading is doubtful. Griesb. and Lachm. read $\gamma \nu \omega ิ \tau \epsilon$ and $\dot{r}_{i} \mu \omega \bar{\nu} \nu$, with $\mathrm{ABD}^{1} \mathrm{FG}$; 10 mss . ; Clarom., JEth. (both Pol. and Platt) ; Theod. (text), al., to which Mcy. adds the argument derived from probablo crroncous transcription (comp. Pref. to Galat. p. xvii.) ; viz. the accidental omission of the TE before TA. The text (Rec., Tisch.) is found in $\mathrm{CD}^{2} \mathrm{D}^{3} \mathrm{EKL}$; great majority of mss., and (what is very important) Vulg., Syr. (both), Coptic, Goth. ; Chrysost., Theod. (comm.), al. The weight of uncial authority is clearly in favor of $\gamma \nu \omega ิ \tau \epsilon$, still the distinct preponderance of $V_{V}$., and the probability of a conformation to Eph. vi. 22 , induce us to retain tho reading of Tisch. ; so De Wette and Alf. $\quad \pi \alpha \rho \alpha \kappa \alpha \lambda \epsilon \in \sigma \eta$ ] 'comfort;' in reference to their own

 ophyl. : according to the other reading the reference would be to St. Paul ; compare on Eph. vi. 22.
9. $\sigma$ v̀ $\nu$ ' $\mathrm{O} \nu \eta \sigma[\mu \omega]$ 'with Onesimus,' seil. $\begin{gathered}\pi \\ \pi\end{gathered} \mu \psi \alpha$. There seems no reason to doubt (Calvin) that the Onesimus here mentioned was the runaway slave of Philemon, whose flight from lis master (Philcm. 15), and subsequent conversion (at Rome by the apostle, gave rise to the exquisite Epistle to Philemon. Whether le was identical with Onesimus, Bishop of Ephesus, mentioned by Ignatius, Eph. § 1 , as affirmed by Ado (ap. Usuard. Martyrology, p. 272, ed. Soll.), is very (loubtful ; sec Pearson, Vind. Ign. ir. 8, p. 463 (A.-C. Libr.). The namo 'was not uncommon, added to which the tradition of the Greek Church (Const. Apost viI. 46) represents the 'Oncsimus Philemonis' to have been Bishop of Berca in Macedonia ; compare Winer, $R W B$. Vol. 11. p. 175. There appear to have been two at least of this name in the carly martyrologies, the legendary notices of those lives have been mixed up together; see Acta Sanct. Feb. 16, Vol. 1I. p. 855 sq.
 'ं $\xi$ v $\mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ ] ' who is of you,' ' who belongs to your city.' This addition seems to have been made, not to give indirect honor and praise to the Colossians (iva
 kovtes, Theoph.), but to commend the tidings and the joint-bearer of them still more to their attention.
$\tau \grave{\alpha} \widehat{\omega} \delta \epsilon]$ 'the things here,' the matters here at Rome, of which $\tau \grave{\alpha} \kappa a \tau^{\prime} \dot{\epsilon} \mu \dot{\epsilon}$; ver. 7, would form the principal portion. The addition $\pi \rho a \tau \tau \delta \mu \in \nu a$ [FG; Vulg.

Aristarchus, and others, and your faithful Epaphras,
${ }^{10}$ ' Aotásérau iuâs 'Apictapxos ó vovalxsalute you. Interchange cpistles with the churclz of Laodicea. Tell Archippus to be diligent.

Clảroman. ; Lat. Ff.] is a self-evident gloss.
10. 'Apícrapxos] A native of Thessalonica (Acts xx. 4), who accompanied St. Paul on his third missionary journey ; he was with the apostle in the tumult at Ephesus (Acts xix. 29), and is again noticed as being with him in the voyage to Rome (Acts xxvii. 2). There he shared the apostle's captivity, cither as an attendant on him (see below) or a fellow-sufferer. Aecording to some traditions of the Greek Church he is said to have been Bishop of $\Lambda$ pamea in Phrygia: accordiug to the Roman martyrologies, Bishop of Thessalonica ; see Martyrol. Rom. p. 343 (Antwerp, 1589 ), Acta Sanct. Aug. 4, Vol. 1. p. 313. In the Menol. Girec. (April 15, Vol. III. p. 57) he is said to have been one of the 70 disciples.
$\delta \sigma v \nu \alpha \iota \chi \mu \alpha \lambda \omega-$ $\tau$ ós $\mu \circ \mathrm{o}]$ 'my fellow-prisoner.' It is certainly singular that in the Epistle to Philemon, written so closely at the same time with the present Epistle, Aristarchus should be mentioned not as a $\sigma v y a u \chi \mu d \lambda^{\prime}$. but as a $\sigma v v \in p \gamma o ́ s$, while Epaphras, who here indirectly, and still more clearly ch. i. 7, appears in the latter capacity, is there a $\sigma v \nu a \iota \chi \mu \dot{\alpha} \lambda \omega \tau 0 s$. There seem only two probable solutions ; cither that their positions had become interchanged by the results of some actual trial, or that their captivity was roluntary, and that they took their turns in sharing the apostle's captivity, and in ministering to him in his bonds. The latter solution, which is that of Fritz. (Rom. Vol. 1. p. xxi, followed by Meyer), seems the most natural ; compare also Wieseler, Chronol. p. 417 note. 'To regard the term as semititular, and as referring to a bygone captivity (Steiger, compare Rom. xvi. 7), does not seem satisfactory. The term is slightly noticeable ('designat hastâ
superatum et captum,' Daven.), as carrying out the metaphor of the soldier of Christ ; compare Meyer in loc.
Mápkos] Almost certainly the same with John Mark the son of Mary (Acts xii. 12), whom St. Paul and St. Barnabas took with them on their first missionary journey, who left them when in Pamphylia, and who was afterwards the cause of the contention between the apostle and St. Barnahas (Acts xv. 39); compare Blunt, Veracity of Evang. § 24, where the connection between John Mark and St. Barnabas, and especially the history of the latter, is ably clucidated. There scems no reason for doubting (Grot., Kienlen, Stud. u. Kirit. 1843, p. 423 sq .) that he was identical with St . Mark the Evangelist ; see Meycr, Einl. z. Evang. d. Markus, p. 2, Fritz. Proleg. in Marc. p. 24. According to ecclesiastical tradition, St. Mark was first Bishop of Alexandria, and suffered martyrdom there ; see Acta Sanct., April 25, Vol. III. p. 344 .
$\alpha, \nu \in \psi \iota \delta s]$ 'cousin,' 7ion- ${ }^{-1}$, Numb. xxxvi. 11 ;
 Voc. Diff. p. 54 (ed. Valck.) ; the proper term for what was sometimes designated as $\epsilon \xi \dot{\xi} \dot{\delta} \delta \lambda \phi o s$ by later and non-classical writers; sce Lobeck, Phryn. p. 306, where the proper meaning of à $\nu \in \psi \psi$ ùs is well discussed. St. Mark was thus not the ' nephew' ( 1 uth., but? See remarks in Transl.), but the 'consobrinus ' Vulg.,

Claroman.), the न!? $\dot{\sigma_{4}}$ (Syr.) of St. Barnabas ; see exx. in Wetst. in loc. '่ $\lambda \alpha \beta \in \tau \in$ '่ $\nu \tau 0 \lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha}$ ] 'ye received commands ;' what these were cannot be determined. The conjectural explanations, - messages from Barnabas (Chrysost.), letters of commendation ('literæ forma$t x^{\prime}$ ), either from St. Paul (Daven.) or the Church of Rome (Est.), ctc. are very



numerous, but do not any of them seem to deserve particular attention. To find
 datorum,' Beng., is gramenatically untenable; the person of the aor. precludes the assumption of its use as an cpistolary present. The parenthetical clause, however, so immediately following the è $\lambda$ dBete èvroidas does certainly seem to suggest that these $\epsilon \nu \tau o \lambda a l$ were of a commendatory nature ; compare Wieseler, Chironolog. p. 452, note. A few MSS. [D $\mathrm{D}_{1} \mathrm{FG}$; Syr., Arr.] read $\delta \delta^{\prime} \xi \alpha \sigma \sim \uparrow a \iota$, probably on the same hypothesis as that of Bengel.
$\delta \epsilon \in \xi \sigma \hat{\wedge} \epsilon a \dot{v} \tau \delta \nu]$
'receive him,' i. e. with hospitality (comp. Matth. x. 14) and friendly feelings (Luke ix. 48 , John iv. 45 ). The historical deduction, founded on the use of the simple $\delta \in \xi \in a \sigma \geqslant 1 \in$ (contrast Acts xxi. 17), that St. Mark had not been in the neighborhood of Colossæ, and would not have been recognized as an assistant of St. Paul (Wieseler, Chronol. p. 567), seems not only precarious but improbable.
11. 'I $\eta \sigma o \hat{v} s \quad \delta \quad \lambda \in \gamma$. $\left.{ }^{\prime} I o \hat{v} \sigma \tau o s\right\rceil$ Mentioned only in this place; probably not identical with Justus of Corinth (Acts xviii. 7). Tradition represents him as afterwards bishop of Eleutheropolis. oí ơ $\nu \tau \in S$ ék $\pi \in \rho \iota \tau$.] ' who are of the circumcision;' participial predication in reference to the three preceding nouns. Meyer, Lachmann, and Buttm. (ed. 1856) remove the stop after $\pi \epsilon p เ \tau o \mu \bar{\eta} s$, and regard the clause as in the nom. ('per anacoluthon'), instead of being in the more intelligible partitive genitive. Such an anacoluthon is not uncommon (sec Jelf, Gr. §.708. 2), but does not seem here necessary as the $\mu$ óvot naturally refers the thought to the category last mentioned; 'these only of that class are my helpers:' compare

Philem. 24, where, though Luke and Demas are grouped together with them as $\sigma v \nu \in p$ oí, the same general order is still preserved. On the formula eival è $\kappa$, with abstract substantives, in which èk retains its primary meaning of origin, compare notes on Gal. iii. 7, and Fritz. on Rom. ii. 8, Vol. I. p. 105.
$\epsilon$ is $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \beta \alpha \sigma \iota \lambda$.] 'unto, towards, the kingdom of God: ' 'adjuverunt Paulum ad regnum Messianum qui ei, quum homines idoneos redderet qui in illud regnum aliquando reciperentur, opitulati sunt,' Fritz. Rom. xiv. 17, Vol. III. p. 201. On the term $\beta \alpha \sigma i \lambda \epsilon i \alpha a \in o \hat{v}$, see an elaborate paper by Bauer (C. G.) in Comment. Theol. Part II. p. 107-172, and Reuss, Theol. Chret. Iv. 22, Vol. I1. p. 244. $\quad$ \%' $\tau \iota \nu \in S$ '́ $\gamma \in \nu$ ] 'men who proved ;' the indefinite öбтเs being here used in what has been termed its classific sense, and pointing to the category to. which the antecedents belong; see notes on Gul. ii. 4, iv. 24. The pas-
 M. p. 189 (ed. Bern.), and rejected by Phrynicus, p. 108 (ed. Lobeck), as a Doric inflexion, occurs not uncommonly in the N. T. (noticeably in 1 Thess.), but, as a carcful comparison of parallel passages seems to show, without any clearly pronounced passive meaning, or any justly appreciable difference from É 'ֹย́vєTo ; comp. Buttm. Irreg. Verbs, p. 50. $\quad \pi \alpha \rho \eta \gamma \circ \rho[\alpha]$ ' $a$ comfort;' an $\alpha \ddot{\alpha} \pi \alpha \xi \lambda \in \gamma \delta \mu$. in the N. T. but not uncommon elsewhere, see the examples in Kypke, Obs. Vol. rı. p. 330 ; add also Æsch. Agam. 95, where the term seems to involve a slightly medical allusion. The distinction of Beng. ' $\pi \alpha$ pa $\mu v$ itia in mœrore domestico, тар $\quad$ rүopia in forensi periculo,' does not seem substantiated by lexical usage. Perhaps




the only real distinction is that mapnropeiv and its derivatives admit of physical and quasi-physical references which are not found with the more purely ethical
 amples in Rost u. Palm, Lex. s. vv.
12. 'E $\pi \alpha \phi \rho \bar{a} s]$ See notes on ch. i. 7; he is specified in the same way as Onesimus, as a native of Colossæ. For the probable reason of the addition, see notes on ver. 9 .

ठồos $\mathrm{x} \rho$. 'I $\eta \sigma_{\text {. }}$. Meyer, and after him Alford, following Griesh. (who, however, reads only Xpıテтev̂), join these wordis with $\delta \dot{\epsilon \xi}$ $\dot{\nu} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ : this certainly scems unnecessary, the title $\delta o u ̂ \lambda o s ~ X \rho$. ' $\mathrm{I} \eta \sigma$. is of quite sufficient weight and importance to stand alone as a title of honor and distinction; so apparently Copt., as it inserts the def. art. before $\delta o \hat{\lambda} \lambda o s$. In Æth. ( Polygl.) the position of the pronoun of the $3 d$ pers. [appy. here for the verb subst., Ludolph, Gr. p. 135] might seem in favor of the other mode of punctuation; Syr. seems in favor of the text. The insertion of 'Iŋбoû after Xpıбтoû (Lachmann, Tisch.) has good critical support [ABCJ; 10 mss. ; Vulg., Copt., Arm.] and is rightly adopted by most modern cditors. $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \omega \nu \iota \zeta \delta \mu \in \nu \circ s]$ 'striving earnestly;' compare Rom. xv. 30, where the compound $\sigma v \operatorname{cog}^{2} \omega$. occurs in a similar context; compare ch. ii. 1 , and notes in loc. I $\nu a \sigma \tau \hat{\eta} \tau \epsilon]$ 'that ye may stand fust;' purpose of the ajovl\}o ${ }^{\prime} \in \nu=s$, the more
 merely $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \epsilon \nu \chi \delta \mu \epsilon \nu 0 s$ ) not requiring any dilution of the telic force of Zva ; comp. notes on Eph. i. 17. $\Sigma$ ir $\eta v a l$ has here, as in Eph. vi. 11, 13, al., the meaning of standing firm and unshaken amidst trials and dangers (see notes on Ephes. ll.cc.), and is more nearly defined by the follow-
ing adjectives and their associated semi-

$\tau \in ́ \lambda \in O<\kappa \alpha\} \pi \in \pi \lambda \eta \rho o \phi$.] ' 'perfect and fully assured ;' secondary predicates of manner (Donalds. Cratyl. §303), the first referring to their maturity and perfectness (ch. i. 28, Eph. iv. 13), the second to their firm persuasion, and the absence of all doubtfulness or scrupulosity. On the distinction between Té $\lambda$ elos and ó $\lambda$ óк $\lambda \eta$ pos ('omnibus numerís absolutus') sce Trench, Synon. § 22, and between $\tau$ é $\lambda$. and äprios, notes on 2 Tim. iii. 17. The reading $\pi \epsilon \pi \lambda \eta \rho \circ \phi$. is adopted by Lachmann and Tisch. [with ABC $\mathrm{D}_{1} \mathrm{FG} ; 6 \mathrm{mss}$.], and both on external and on internal grounds is to be preferred to $\pi \epsilon \pi \lambda \eta \rho \omega \mu$ évol (Rcc.).
ढ่ $\nu \pi \alpha \nu \tau \zeta$ ฟ $\in \lambda \dot{\eta} \mu \alpha \tau \iota$ ] 'in every (manifestation of the) will of (God,' i. e. 'in everything which God willeth' (Winer, Gr. § $18.4, \mathrm{p} .101$ ), which, though not grammatically, yet in common usage becomes equivalent to 'in all the will of God,' Auth. It is doubtful whether these words are to be joined with the finite verb (Mcyer, Alf. ; compare Rom. v. 2, 1 Corinth. xv. 1), or with the secondary predicates $\tau \in ́ \lambda \epsilon \iota o \iota ~ к а l ~ \pi \epsilon \pi \lambda \eta \rho \circ \phi . ~(D e ~ W) . ~.$. The latter is most simple, as defining the sphere in which the $\tau \in \lambda \epsilon t \dot{\sigma} \tau \eta s$ and $\pi \lambda \eta \rho о ф о \rho i a$ was to be evinced and find its realization ; so Chrys., Theoph., and perhaps Coptic, Gothic, who even with $\pi \epsilon \pi \lambda \eta \rho \omega \mu \epsilon \in \nu 0 \iota$ (comp. on Eph. v. 18) connect $\epsilon \nu \pi a \nu \pi i \geqslant \otimes \in \lambda$. with the secondary predicates. The Vv., however, in such cases cannot be appealed to with confidence, as they commonly preserve the ambiguous order of the original.
13. $\mu \alpha \rho \tau v \rho \hat{\omega} \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho]$ Confirmatory ( $\gamma$ à $\rho$ ) testimony to the earnestness and activity of Epaphras.
$\pi \circ \lambda \dot{v} \nu$



$\pi \delta \nu \circ \nu]$ ' much labor ;' not such as that which attends a combat (Eadic), but, as the etymological affinities of tióvos [connected vith $\pi$ tévoual, and probably derived from ミПA-, see Benfey, Wurzellex. Vol. Ir. p. 360] seem to suggest, such as implies a putting forth all one's strength (intentio); compare Suidas $\pi \delta{ }^{2}$ vos* $\sigma \pi o u-$ $\delta \eta$, ėmía.ats. The word is rare in the N. T., only here and Rev. xvi. 10, 11, xxi.4. This may account for the variety of reading; ко́тov, D'FG; ऽйдov $\mathrm{D}^{2} \mathrm{D}^{3} \mathrm{EKL}$ (Rec.). The text is supported by $\mathrm{ABC} ; 80$; Coptic (emkah), and indirectly by DIFG : so Lachm., Tisch. A $\alpha 0 \delta \iota \kappa \in[\neq]$ For a brief notice of this city, see notes on cl. ii. 1.
'I $\in \rho \alpha \pi o ́ \lambda \in \ell]$ An important city of Phrygia, about twenty English miles NNW. (surely not 'östlich,' Winer) of Colossæ, celcbrated for its mineral springs, and a mophitic cavern called Plutonium, which was apparently connected with the worship of the 'Magna Mater;' see Strabo, Geogr. XIIr. 4. 14 (ed. Kramer), Pliny, Hist. Nat. Yr. 93 (ed. Sillig). The site of Hierapolis appears to have been close to the modern Pambuk-Kulasi, round which extensive ruins are still to be traced; see Forbiger, Alt. Geograph. Vol. I1. p. 348, 349, Arundell, Seven Churches, p. 79 sq., ib. Asia Minor, Vol. II. p. 200 sq., and a good article in Kitto's Bibl. Cyclop. Vol. Ir. p. 848. It is curious that this city should apparently have been unnoticed in Pau1y, Real. Encycl.
14. \ovкâs] The Evangelist, who according to ancient tradition (Ircnæus, Heer. III. 14. 1, 'creditus est referre nobis evangclium') has been regarded as identical with the iatpos à $\gamma a \pi \eta \tau d s$ here mentioned. The tradition that he was a painter (Nicephor, Hist. Eccl. II. 13)
is late and untrustworthy. There seems no etymological grounds whatever for identifying him further with the Lucius mentioned in Rom. xvi. 21 (Origen) : Lucas may have been a contraction of Lucanus, or possibly even of Lucilius, but not of Lucius. For further notices see notes on 2 Tim. iv. 11. The addition $\delta$ iarpds ó àyarŋтd̀s may possibly have been intended to distinguish the Evangelist from others of the same name (Chrys.), but more probably is only a further designation similar to those given to Tychicus (ver. 7), Onesimus (ver. 9), Aristarchus, Mark (ver. 10), Justus (ver. 11), and Epaphras (ver. 12).
$\Delta \eta \mu \bar{u} s]$ Mentioned as one of the apostle's $\sigma v \nu \in p \gamma o$ ó (Philem. 24), but too well. remembered as having deserted him in the hour of need; see notes on 2 Tim. iv. 10. Whether the omission of a title of honor or affection is accidental, or owing to his having already shown symptoms of the defection of which he was afterwards guilty (Meyer), cannot be determined. The latter does not seem improbable, especially as he here occupies the last place in the enumeration ; contrast Philem. 24.
15. $\kappa \alpha{ }^{\text {' }} \mathrm{N} v \mu \phi \hat{\alpha} \nu$ ) 'and (among them) Nymphas,' kal being here used to add the special to the general (see notes on Eph. v. 18, vi. 19), and to particularize Nymphas, who apparently belonged to Laodicea and, as the following words seem to show, was a person of some im-
 $\tau \delta \nu \not ้ \sim \delta \delta \rho \alpha$, Chrys., - who, however, adds too restrictively, eľ $\gamma \in \dot{\eta}$ oikia av̉tô̂ èk$\kappa \lambda \eta \sigma i \alpha$; compare notes on Philem. 2. The repetition of the more generic $\tau \hat{\eta}$ $\Lambda$ ๙oठ. єॄкк入. in ver. 16 would seem to show that the church in the house of Nymphas did not comprehend all tho




Christians of Laodicea. The form Nú $\mu$ фas (Lachm., Buttm., with B${ }^{2}$ ) is not correct ; the last syllable is circumflexed, and marks a probable contraction from Nymphodorus (Pliny, Hist. Nat. vir: 2), as 'О $\mathrm{\lambda} \nu \mu \pi$ âs (Rom. xvi. 15) from Olympiodorus, Z Z $\nu$ âs (Tit. iii. 13) from Zenodorus ; compare Fritz. Rom. Vol. III. p. 309. $\kappa \alpha \tau^{3}$ o? kov aủтồ] So Rom. xvi. 5, in reference to Prisca and Aquila, who had also at Corinth (1 Cor. xvi. 19) devoted their house to a similar righteous use; compare on Philem. 2, and see especially Neand., Planting, Vol. 1. p. 151, note (Bohn). The reading is somewhat doubtful. The text is supported by DEFGKL ; great majority of mss. ; Chrys., Theod., al. (Rec., Tisch.), and appy. rightly, for though au่т $\omega$ ע $[\mathrm{AC} ; 7 \mathrm{mss} . ;$ Slav. (ms.)] is not improbable as at first sight a more difficult reading, it may still have easily - arisen from the preceding plural, aud the desire, even at the expense of the sense, to identify the whole church of Laodicea with that in the house of Nymphas. If av̉ $\frac{\omega}{\nu} \nu$ be adopted (Mey., Alf.), then the plural must be referred to ' Nymphas and his family;' involved $\kappa \alpha$ $\tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} \sigma \dot{\nu} \nu \epsilon \sigma \iota \nu$ in the preceding substantive; see Jelf, $G r$. § 379. b, compare Winer, Gr. § 22. 3, p. 132. Lachm. reads av̀т $\mathrm{n}_{\mathrm{s}}$. but on authority [B;67**] manifestly insufficient.
16. $\dot{\eta}$ '̇ $\pi เ \sigma \tau \circ \lambda \eta$ n] 'the present letter;' compare Rom. xvi. 22, 1 Thess. v. 27. Several cursive mss. add av̉兀そ́, but quite unnecessarily; see Winer, Gram. § 18.1, p. 97.
$\pi о เ \eta \sigma \alpha \tau \in \mathbb{Z} \alpha]$ 'cause that;' a formula of later Greek (John xi. 37, compare Rev. iii. 9), though not without parallel in the $\pi o t \epsilon$ ív $\delta \pi \omega$ (Jelf, Gr. § 666, obs.) of the classical writers. The proper force
of qua, though weakened and somewhat approximating to the lax use of $\tau 0 \hat{u}$ with the infinitive after $\pi 0 t \epsilon \hat{i} \nu(A c t s ~ i i i . ~ 12, ~$ Josh. xxii. 26, al.), is not wholly lost; see Winer, Gr. § 44. 8, p. 301.
$\boldsymbol{\tau} \eta \nu$ èk $\Lambda a \circ \delta$.] 'that from Laodicea,' not scripta est ex Laodicensibus] Syr., but corrected in Philox., or 'quam scripsi ex Laod.,' ङth. (compare Theod.), but, with the usual and proper force of the preposition, ' that out of Laodicea,' 'boci ist us Laud.,' Goth., 'ebölchen Laod.,' Copt., - two prepositions being really involved in the clause 'the Epistle sent to and to be received from or out of Laod.,' but the latter, by a very intelligible and not uncommon attraction, alone expressed ; compare Luke ix. 61, xi. 13, and see Winer, Gr. § 66. 6, p. 553, Jelf, $G r . \S 647$. a. The real difficulty is to determine what letter is here referred to. Setting aside attempts to identify it with the 1st Epistle to Tim. (Theophylact); the Ist Ep. of St. John (Lightf.), the Ep. to Philemon - an essentially private letter (Wieseler, Chronol. p. 452), two opinions deserve consideration ; $(a)$ that it is the Epistle to the Ephesians ; (b) that it is a lost Epistle. For $(a)$ we have the similarity of contents, and the probability, from the absence of greetings and local allusions, that the Ep. to the Ephesians was designed for other readers than those to whom it was primarily addressed. Against it, the great improbability that the apostle should know that his Epist. to the Ephesians would have, reached Laodicea at or near the time of the delivery of his Ep. to the Colossians. For (b) we may urge the highly probable circumstance that Tychicus might have been the bearer of the two letters

##  $K v \rho i ́ \varphi$, ǐva av̉тท̀ $\nu \pi \lambda \eta \rho o i ̂ s$.

to the two neighboring cities, leaving that to Laodicea first, with orders for the interchange, and then continuing his journey. Against it there is the à priori improbability that a letter which, from the present direction given by the apostle, stood apparently in some degree of parallelism to that to the Colossians (we have no right to assume that it was ' of a merely temporary or local nature,' Eadie ; see contra Meycr), should have been lost to the Church of Christ. The fact that the orthodox early Church (compare Jones on Canon, Part III. 6) does not seem to have ever acquiesced in (b) makes the decision very difficult; as, however, the Ep. to the Colossians does appear to have been written first, - as the title toîs év ' ${ }^{\text {E }} \boldsymbol{E} \phi$ '́ $\sigma \omega$ (Eph. i. 1) does seem to preclude our assigning to that Epistle a further destination than to the churches dependent on Ephesus (see crit. note on Eph. i. 1), - as there does seem a trace of another lost Ep. (1 Cor. v. 9), - as the close neighborhood of Colossæ and Laodicea might prepare us to admit a great similarity in contents, and consequently a very partial loss to the Church, - and lastly, as à priori arguments on such subjects are always to be viewed with some suspicion, we decide in favor of (b), and believe that an actual Epistle to the Laodiccans is here alluded to, which, possibly from its similarity to its sister-Epistle, it has not pleased God to preserve to us : see Meyer, Einl. z. Eph. p. 9 sq., where the question is fairly argued. It may be added in conclusion that the above reasoning rests on the assumption that the Epistle to the Ephesians was written to that Church, and that the words ${ }^{\epsilon} \nu \bar{\nu}{ }^{2} E \phi \epsilon \in \sigma \omega$ are genuine. It is right, however, to add that the newdiscovered $\approx$ rejects them, and that thus an important authority has been added
to the side of those who deem that a blank was left for the name of the Church, and that the Epistle was purely encyclical. If this view (which still seems very doubtful) be adopted, the balance will probably lean more to $(a)$; at preśent, however, no more need be said than this, that the title of the Epistle to the Ephesians and the present question may justly be considered as in somewhat close connection. The forged Epistle to the Laodiceans deserves no notice, being a mere cento out of St. Paul's Epistles ; see Jones, on Canon, Part III. 6.
17. ${ }^{2} \mathrm{~A} \rho \chi\{\pi \pi \omega]$ A church-officer of Colossæ, - not of Laodicea (Wieseler, Chronol. p. 452, compare Const. Apost. viI. 46) ; possibly an instructor (Theod. Philem. 2), but more probably a friend (Chrys., Theophyl. ib.) of the household of Philemon, - if, indeed, on account of the position of Arch. in the salutation (Philemon 2), not more nearly related (compare Olsh.). What the $\delta$ iakovía of Archippus was, cannot be determined; that he was a $\delta$ tárovos in the literal meaning (compare Wordsw.), does not seem improbable. Tradition represents him to have suffered martyrdom at Chonæ; see Menolog. Groccum, Nov. 23, Vol. 1. p. 206. A brief notice will also be found in the Acta Sanctorum, March 20, Vol. III. p. 82. On the somewhat unusual (Ionic) form єไँ $\pi \alpha \tau$ (Matth. x. 27, xxi. 5), see Winer, Gr. § 15, p. 78.
$\beta \lambda \epsilon \in \epsilon \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \delta \iota \alpha \kappa$ о $\nu\{\alpha \nu]$ 'see to, take heed to, the ministry;' somewhat too strongly Syriac, $\dot{\square}$ ํำ! [diligens esto], though rightly preserving the construction : for examples of this meaning of $\beta \lambda \epsilon ́ \pi \epsilon \iota \nu$ see Elsner, Obs. Vol. II. p. 272, and comp. on Eph. v. 15. Grotius and others assume here a Hebraistic inversion
 tion of the order of the words and of the more usual meaning of qva; the object of the $\beta \lambda \epsilon \in \pi \epsilon \iota \nu$ тŋ̀ $\boldsymbol{\delta}$ ธакоуíav on the part of Archippus was to be "עva aü $\grave{\eta} \nu \pi \lambda \eta \rho o \hat{\imath}$; compare 2 John 8, and notes on Gal. iv. 11. The expression $\pi \lambda \eta \rho \circ \hat{v} \nu$ ঠıaкovíal occurs again Acts xii. 25 ; see examples in Raphel, Annot. Vol. 11. p. 538, Kypke, Obs. Vol. 11. p. 331, and Wetst. in loc. $\quad \pi \alpha \rho \in ́ \lambda \alpha \beta \in S \quad \in \nu$ $\mathbf{K} v \rho i(\omega]$ 'didst receive in the Lord;' not ' per Dominum,' Daven., nor 'secundum Domini precepta,' Grot., but as always, 'in Domino,' Vulg., Clarom., al. The Lord was, as it were, the sphere in which he had received his Sıakovia, and out of which it found no place; see notes on Eph. iv. 16, vi. 1, Phil. ii. 19, and elsewhere. The addition, as Meyer well observes, still more enhances the obligation of Archippus to fulfil a $\delta \iota a \kappa o \nu i ́ a ~ s o ~ r e-~$ ceived.
18. $\delta \dot{\alpha} \sigma \pi \alpha \sigma \mu \delta s$ к. т. $\lambda$.] Autograph salutation of the apostle, to attest the authenticity of the document (2 Thess. iii. 17, contrasted with ib. ch. ii.
2) ; compare 1 Cor. xvi. 21, and notes on Gal. vi. 11. The gen. חaú入ov is in apposition to the personal pronoun involved in $\epsilon \mu \hat{q}$; see examples in Jelf, $G r$. § 467.4.
$\mu \nu \eta \mu o \nu \in \dot{\prime} \in \tau \in$ $\mu o v \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \delta \in \sigma \mu \hat{\omega} \nu]$ 'Remember ary BONDS.' A touching exhortation, speaking vividly to the hearts of his readers, and breathing patience, love, and encouragement ; $\mu \in \gamma^{\prime}$ í $\sigma \tau \eta$ ठ̇̀ $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha ́ \kappa \lambda \eta \sigma t s$ aùuroîs
 $\delta \epsilon \delta \epsilon \mu \epsilon ́ \nu 0 \nu$, Theoph., compare Chrysost. The remark of Eadie is just, that as the apostle used his hand to write he felt his bonds yet more keenly, but he should have remembered, that it was (in all probability) not the left but the right hand that was bound to the soldier that guarded him; see Smith, Dict. Antiq. s. v. 'Catena,' p. 207.
 notes on Eph. vi. 24, and on the various meanings of $\chi$ d́pis, Waterl. Euchar. x Vol. Iv. p. 666. The $\alpha \mu \eta ̀ \nu$ of Rec. is found in DEKL; $\dot{V}_{\mathrm{V}}$, and Ff., but is rightly rejected by modern editors on preponderant uncial authority.

## TIIE EPISTLE TO PIIILENON.

## INTRODUCTION.

Tris exquisite and interesting Epistle, alike a master-piece of persuasive tact and delicacy, and an enduring model of truest Christian courtesy, was written by St. Paul to Philemon closely about the same time as the Epistle to the Church of Colossx, and not improbably stands first in the group of Epistles written during the first captivity at Rome ; comp. Davidson, Introd. Vol. iII. p. 158. It would thus have been written about A.D. 61 or 62 : see Introd. to Colossians.

It was addressed to Philemon, most probably a member of the Church of Colosse (ver. 2, compared with Col. iv. 9, 17), who had originally been converted to Christianity by the apostle (ver. 19), and who, from the honorable title of 'fellow-laborer' (ver. 2; compare ver. 24 and Col. iv. 11), coupled with the notice of 'the church in his house' (ver. 2) and the general tone of the Epistle, appears to have been a person of distinction, worth, and Christian zeal and earnestness (ver. 7). The bearer of the Epistle was Onesimus, a slave who had run away from, and as it would seem robbed Philemon (ver. 18), but who now, after having had the blessing of meeting with St. Paul at Rome, and of being converted to Christianity by him (ver. 10), was returning to the master he had wronged, changed and repentant, especially commended to his love and forgiveness (ver. 17), and mentioned, not without honor (Col. iv. 9), to the Church of which both were now alike to be members. His fellow traveller was Tychicus, the bearer of the Epistles to the Churches of Colossæ and Ephesus (Col. iv. 7, Eph. vi. 21), to whose care and good offices he was not improbably further committed, and who might have been instructed by the apostle to induce the Colossian Christians generally to receive the hitherto uprofitable servant (comp. ver. 11) with forbearance and favor.

The object of the Epistle is very clearly set before us, - an affectionate desire on the part of the apostle to restore Onesimus to the confidence and love of his master, and to insure for him a reception which he might justly have been considered wholly to have forfeited. The exquisite tact with which his fraudulent conduct towards Philemon is alluded to (ver. 18), 一the ab-
sence of everything tending to excuse or palliate the misdeed, yet the use of every expression and sentiment calculated to win the fullest measures of Philemon's forgiveness, - has never failed to call forth the reverential admiration of every expositor of this Epistle from the earliest times down to our own day.

The originality with which the Epistle is thus stamped, and the strong external testimonies of antiquity which, short as this Epistle is, are by no means wanting (Tertull. ady. Marc. v. 42, Origen, Hom. xix. in Jerem. ; in Matth. Tract. xxxiri. xxxiv., Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. ini. 25), may justly be said to place its genuineness and authenticity beyond all doubt. It appears, however, to have been carped at in early times (see Jerome, Procem. in Philem.), and has recently been considered by a modern critic (Baur, Apostel Paulus, p. 475 sq.) as of doubtful authorship, but on grounds so utterly untenable that we may with justice refuse to notice what the very author of the criticism seems to feel (p. 476) is open to the charge of an undue and unreasonable scepticism.

## THE EPISTLE T0 PIIILEMON.

Apostolic address and salusation.

##  


2. $\dot{\alpha} \delta \in \lambda \phi \hat{\eta}]$ So Lachm. and Tisch. ed. 1, with AD1E'FG; 3 mss.; Claroman., Amit., Tol., Copt., Eth. (Platt) ; Hes., Hier. (Meyer). In his later edd. Tisch. reverts to the reading of liec. with $\mathrm{D}^{3} \mathrm{E}^{2} \mathrm{KL}$; nearly all mss. ; Syr. (both, - but Philox. with asterisk) ; Theod.-Mlops. (expressly), Chrys., Theod., al. The external authorities are thus very nearly balanced ; it does not, however, seem improbable that the supposed connection between Philemon and Apphia might have led to the same title being applied to each.

1. $\delta \epsilon \in \sigma \mu$ os $\mathrm{X} \rho$. ' $\mathbf{I} \eta \sigma_{\text {. }}$ ] 'a prisoner of Christ Jesus,' 'whom Christ Jesus and His cause have made a prisoner ;' gen. of the author of the captivity; see Winer, Gram. § 30. 2, p. 170 (ed. 6), and notes on Eph. iii. 1, 2 Tim. i. 8. Considering the subject of the Epistle, no title could be more appropriate, or more feelingly prepare Philemon for the request which the apostle is about to make to him. On the titles adopted by St. Paul in his salutations, see notes on Phil. i. 1, and especially on Col. i. 1. $\kappa \alpha \backslash T \iota \mu o ́ N \in o s]$ Associated with the apostle in the same way as in 2 Cor. i. 1, Col. i. 1, each having a separate, and not, as in Phil. i. 1 (compare 1 and 2 Thess. i. 1), a common title; see notes on Phil. i., and on Col. i. 1. The association of Timothy in a letter which has the character of a private communication was perhaps, as Chrys. suggests, $\ddot{\omega} \sigma \tau$ $\kappa$ кàкє̂̂ข

$\Phi \backslash \lambda \eta \mu \circ \nu t]$ Philemon was a member of the Church of Colossæ (compare Col. iv. 9), who owed his conversion to St . Paul (verse 19), and who by his zeal in the Christian cause (verse 5), showed himself worthy of the consideration and regard which the apostle evinces for him in this Epistle. There does not seem any good ground for the opinion of Wieseler (Chronol. p. 452) that Philemon belonged to Laodicea; his house at Colossæ was shown in the time of Theodoret (Argum. ad Philem.), and tradition (Const. Apost. vir. 46) represents him as having been bishop of that city, - not of Laodicea, as Alford, Prolegom. p. 114. In the Menol. Groecum, Nov. 23, Vol. I. p. 206, he is said to have suffered martyrdom with Archippus at Chonie.
$\sigma v \nu \in \rho \gamma \uparrow \hat{\eta} \dot{\eta} \mu \omega \nu]$ 'our fellow-helper;' more special designation suggested by the zeal of Philemon for the Gospel. The genitive $\eta \mu \omega \hat{\omega}$, as the single article hints, belongs to $\sigma \nu \nu \in p \gamma \hat{\varphi}$ and the verbal


I thank God for thy prog－ ress in faith，and pray that it may prove beneficial to others ：the proofs of thy love to the saints gladdens me．
$\alpha \dot{\alpha} \gamma \alpha \pi \eta \tau \hat{\omega}$ ，compare Rom．i．7．Both titles are dwelt upon by Chrys．and Theophyl．； the latter says，$\epsilon \mathfrak{l}$ ả $\gamma \alpha \pi \eta \tau \tau \dot{\iota}, \delta \omega \dot{\sigma} \in \zeta \tau \grave{\eta} \nu$

 кпрúrүатоs．

2．＇ $\mathrm{A} \pi \phi$［a］Most probably，as sug－ gested by Chrysos，and the Greek com－ mentators，the wife of Philemon．If this be so，it is not improbable that Archip－ pus may have been their son；see notes on Col．iv．17．The name＇A $\boldsymbol{\text { ¢ }}$＇$\alpha$ ，which in some mss．appears in the form＇A $A \pi i \alpha$ （see Acts xxviii．15），is the softened form of the Latin＇Appia＇（Grot．）．
＇A $\rho \chi[\pi \pi \omega]$ Supposed by Wieseler （Chronol．p．452），but without sufficient reason，to have been of the Church of Laodicea；see notes on Col．iv．17．He is here distinguished by the honorable title of $\sigma v \nu \sigma \tau \rho a \tau เ \omega ́ \tau \eta s$ with the apostle； compare $2 \mathrm{Tim} . \mathrm{ii} .3$ ．On the Alexan－ drian form $\sigma v \nu a \tau \rho$ ．see Winer，Gr．§ 5. 4，p．46．$\quad \tau \hat{n} \kappa \alpha \tau^{\prime}$ oîcóv $\sigma \circ v . \epsilon \kappa \kappa \lambda$.$] ＇the church in thy house；＇$ not merely the household of Philemon，
 but，as the expression seems regularly to designate，the assembly of Christians that were accustomed to meet at the house of Philemon，and join with his houschold in public prayer ；compare on Col．iv．15，and Pearson，Creed，Art．ix． Vol．I．p． 397.
 そँ $\sigma \tau \omega$（Koch）；see notes on Eph．i．2：the regular form of salutation in St．Paul＇s Epp．On the spiritual meaning of the blended form of address，see notes on Gal．i．2，Eph．i． 2 ；add also on Phil．i． 1. ка！Kupíov］Scil．каlà à̀ Kирíov к．т．入．


Dom．nostro］：the Socinian interpreta－ tion кal（ $\pi a \tau \rho \delta s$ ）Kuplou seems very im－ probable ；see notes on Phil．i． 2.

4．$\epsilon \dot{v} \chi \propto \rho เ \sigma \tau \hat{\omega}]$ Usual eucharistic commencement in reference to the spir－ itual state of his convert ；＇a gratulatione more suo incipit，＇Calv．：see Rom．i． 9 ， 1 Cor．i．4，and notes on Phil．i．1，where this mode of address is briefly alluded to． For the meaning and uses of civxapioteiv （＇gratias agere＇）in earlier and later Greek，see notes on Col．i．12．As in Rom．i．8， 1 Corinth．i． 4 ，Phil．i． 3 ，the thanks are returned $\tau \hat{\varphi} \Theta \epsilon \hat{\varphi} \mu \circ v$ ，to Him ＇whose he was and whom he served＇ （Acts xxvii．23），a particularizing mode of address called forth from the warm heart of the apostle，by a remembrance of the great mercies vouchsafed to him in having thus been blessed in his labors ； comp．on Phil．i． 3.
$\pi \alpha \dot{\nu} \tau$ от $\in \kappa$ к． $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ ．］Participial sentence， defining more closely both when the eu－ xaplotia took place，and the circum－ stances under which it was offered to God；＇nunquam oro quin tui memine－ rim，＇Est．The adverb is here，as also in Phil．i．4，Col．i．3，more naturally joined with the participle（Chrysostom， Theod．）than with the preceding ev̉ $\chi$ 人－ pıorâ（Syr．，死thiop．），see notes on Phil． i． 4 ，where the reasons for a connection with the participle are more distuct than in the present case．
$\mu \nu \in\{a \nu \sigma o \nu]$＇mention of thee，＇$\mu \nu \in i \alpha a$ receiving this meaning when in associa－ tion with $\pi 0 t \in \hat{\sigma} \sim \alpha a t$ ；see notes on Phil．i． 3．The formula is not uncommon in classical Greek（comp．Plato，Protag． p． 317 E ，and a little more strongly ib． Phoedr．p． 254 A），and，as Koch remarks，
 Thess．iii．6， 2 Tim．i．3），the＇dynamic＇


middle $\pi ⿰ 丿 \epsilon$ є̂̃ova not being without its force and significance ；comp．Krüger， Sprachl．§ 52．8．1 sq．，and notes on Col． iv．i．$\quad \dot{\epsilon} \pi!\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \rho o \sigma \in v \chi \hat{\omega} \nu]$ ＇in my prayers，＇not merely＇at the time of making them，＇but，with a tinge of local force，＇in orationibus，＇Vulg．，Syr．， Copt．，scil．when engaged in offering them；see Bernhardy，Synt．v．23．a，p． 246，and notes on Eph．i． 16.

5．க̉кои́ $\omega \nu$ ］＇as I am hearing；＇cau－ sal participle（Donalds．Gr．§616），giv－ ing the reason for the $\epsilon \dot{v} \chi \alpha \rho \iota \sigma \tau \hat{\omega}$ ，or，per－ haps more exactly，for the circumstances which especially led to its being offered；
 $\mu a \sigma \Delta \nu \dot{\alpha} \nu \nu \mu \nu \hat{\omega}$ ，Theod．：contrast Rom．i． 8，where ejuap．is followed by the more definite ö $\%$ ，and the causal sentence is expressed in a passive form．
$\hat{\eta} \nu$ モ̌ $\chi \in$ bs］＇which（faith）thou hast to－ ward the Lord Jesus，and dost evince to－ ward all the saints．＇There is some diffi－ culty in these words．In the first place the reading is doubtful；Lachm．，with ACD1E ；17．137，reads cis $\tau \delta \nu \mathrm{K}$ úptov， and with DE ； 10 mss ；Syr．，al．inverts the order of $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \dot{\alpha} \pi \eta \nu$ and $\pi\{\sigma \tau เ \nu$ ．Both， however，seem corrections suggested by the somewhat unusual $\pi i \sigma \tau \iota s \pi \rho \partial s$ Kúptov， and the apparently anomalous connec－ tion of $\pi i \sigma \tau \iota \nu$ with єis $\pi$ dávtas toùs árious． Adopting the present text，we have two explanations ；（a）that of Meyer，recently adopted by Winer in the last edition of his grammar（ $\$ 50.2$, p． 365 ），according to which $\pi i \sigma \tau t s$ is taken as equivalent to ＇fidelity，＇and justified by Rom．iii．3， Gal． 7.22 ，and Tit．ii． 10 ，in the first of which passages the meaning occurs in a very different combination，while in the second it is more than doubtful（see notes in loc．），and in the third is asso－ ciated with an adjective；（b）that of Grot．，al．，derived from Theodoret and
followed by De Wette，Alf．，and most commentators，according to which $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ a $\gamma a \dot{a} \pi \eta \nu$ is to be referred by a kind of $\chi^{t^{-}}$ aruds（Jelf，Gr．§ 904．3）to єis $\pi$ ávias Toùs árious，and $\tau \eta \dot{\nu} \pi i \sigma \tau \iota \nu$ alone to $\tau \delta \nu$ Kúpıov．Of these（ $a$ ）does not seem ten－ able，as it is surely very improbable that， in combination with ả $\gamma \dot{a} \pi \eta$ ，$\pi i \sigma \tau \iota \iota$ should revert to a meaning so very unusual，and in St．Paul＇s Epistles so very feebly sup－ ported，as that of＇fidelitas．＇The sec－ ond（b），grammatically considered，is ad－ missible（see Winer，Gr．§50．2，p．365）， but the distinctive $\hat{\eta}^{\nu} \nu$ Є＇$\chi \in เ s$（sce Meyer） and the repetition of the article with both substantives make it very unplau－ sible．

In this difficulty a third view seems to deserve considera－ tion，according to which $\pi i \sigma \tau \iota s \pi \rho \partial s \tau \delta \nu$ $K \dot{v} p$ ．$=$＇a faith directed towards the Lord＇（comp． 1 Thess．i．8），in a purely spiritual reference，while $\pi i ́ \sigma \tau \iota s$ cis $\pi$ d́ $\nu$－ tus $\kappa . \tau, \lambda .=$＇$a$ faith evinced towards （erga）the saints，＇with a more practical reference，scil．as shown in contributions to their necessities，－a meaning sug－ gested to the reader by the preceding ç $\gamma a \dot{\pi} \pi \nu$ ，and conveyed by the studied prepositional interchange．The prepo－ sitions then substantially preserve the distinction alluded to in notes on Ephes． iv．12，Tit．i． 1 ；$\pi \rho$ òs refers to a more remote，cis to a more immediate，applica－ tion of the specified action，whether erga （2 Corinth．viii．24， 1 Pet．iv．9），contra （Rom．viii．7），or with a more neutral ref．（2 Cor．x．1，Col．iii．9）；compare Winer，Gr．§ 49．a，p． 353 ．This seems also confirmed by etymology，for while cis（ $̇ \nu s$ ）incorporates the idea of locality， of having reached the place（compare Donaldson Cratyl．§ 170），$\pi \rho \delta$ s primarily presents little more than the idea of sim－ ple motion forwards；see Donalds．ib． $\$ 169,171$ ．On the various construc－


tions of $\pi i \sigma \tau t s$ and $\pi \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon \dot{v} \omega$, see Reuss, Theol. Chret. Iv. 13, Vol. II. p. 129.
6. $\delta \pi \omega s$ ] 'in order that;' dependent on $\epsilon \dot{u} \chi \alpha \rho เ \sigma \tau \hat{\omega}$, or perhaps more immediately on $\mu \nu \in$ éa $\sigma o v$ тotoú $\mu \in \nu 0 s$ èml $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ $\pi \rho o \sigma \epsilon \nu \chi \hat{\omega} \nu$, and conveying the object of the prayer (2 Thessalon. i. 12), perhaps slightly blended with the subject of it;

 more distinctly Theod., $\delta \in ́ o \mu \alpha \iota \kappa \alpha l ~ a ̉ \nu \tau \iota^{-}$

 the particle an exclusive reference to result or consequence (Estius; compare Tittmann, Synon. II. p. 55, 58), or to refer it to ver. 5 as giving the 'tendency' of $\hat{\eta} \nu$ 光 $\chi \in L s$ (Beng., Meyer), is very unsatisfactory. It is singular that two such good commentators as Beng. and Mey. should agree in an interpretation so utterly pointless ; see Winer, $G r . \S 53.6$, p. 410. On the essential meaning of $\delta \pi \omega s$, and its distinction from $\% \nu a$, see notes on 2 Thess. i. 12.
$\kappa \circ เ \nu \omega \nu$ \{ $\alpha \tau \hat{\eta} s \pi\{\sigma \tau \in \omega$ s $\sigma o v]$ 'communication of thy faith ;' scil. 'participation in thy faith enjoyed by others,' $\pi!\sigma=$ $\tau \epsilon \omega \hat{s}$ being not a gen. subjecti, but, as more commonly (except with a personal pron.), a gen. objecti ; comp. Phil. ii. 1, iii. 10 , al. The clause thus serves to clear up, and indeed indirectly confirm the interpretation of the preceding $\pi\{\sigma \tau \iota \nu$ eis rávias roùs áyious. The meaning as-
 $\pi i \sigma \tau t s, \eta$ रotv $\boldsymbol{\eta} \pi$ otós, 'fides tua, quam communem nobiscum habes' (Bengel), or the more concrete, 'beneficentia ex fide profecta' (Estius, compare Beza), does not seem accordant with the use of коเvшyía in St. Paul's Epistles when associated with a gen. rei; compare notes on Phil. ii. 1.
$\epsilon^{2} \nu \in \rho \gamma \hat{\eta} s$ - $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ ยทтa] 'might become operative,' scil.
 tus in operibus] Syr. ; भivetat èvepỳ̀s ถ์ $\tau \alpha \nu$ є้ $\rho \gamma \alpha$ є้ $\chi \eta$, Chrys. The translation 'evidens,' Vulg., 'manifesta,' Clarom., appears to have arisen from a mistaken reading ėvapyńs. $\epsilon^{2} \nu$ ย̇ $\pi \iota \gamma-$ $\nu \omega \sigma \in t \pi \alpha \nu \tau \delta s \dot{\alpha} \gamma$.$] 'in the (complete)$ knowledge of every good thing;' sphere and element in which the évépyela was to be displayed (see notes on Phil. i. 9), serving also indirectly to define the ' mo-
 ठià̀ $\tau o v ̂ ~ \epsilon ̇ \pi เ \gamma \nu \omega ิ \nu a l ~ \sigma \epsilon ~ \kappa a l ~ \pi \rho a ́ \tau \tau \epsilon เ \nu ~ \pi a ̂ \nu a ̉ \gamma a-$ No $\delta \nu$, Ecum., who however unnecessarily introduces $\kappa a l$ i $\pi \rho \dot{d} \tau \tau \epsilon \iota \nu$, and incorrectly limits it to Philemon, whereas the previous interpretation of кoıv $\omega \nu$ ía shows that the reference is to others, to the kot$\nu \omega \nu o l \tau \hat{\eta} s \pi i \sigma \tau \epsilon \omega \dot{s} \sigma o v$; see Meyer in loc. On the meaning of $\overline{\epsilon \pi} \pi \gamma \nu \omega \sigma \iota s$ ('accurata cognitio'), see notes on Eph. i. 17, Phil. i. 9 , but observe that this force of $\hat{k} \pi l$ cannot always be conveyed in translation; compare on Col. i. $9 . \quad \tau 0 \hat{v}$ $\epsilon \quad \nu \quad \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\imath} \nu]$ ' which is in us ;' with special reference to them as Christians, and as recipients of the good gifts and graces of God. The reading is slightly doubtful. Lachmann omits roû with AC; 17, but on authority manifestly insufficient. Again Rec. reads $\dot{u} \mu i \nu$ with FG; Vulg. (ed.), Syriac (both), Coptic; al.; but on weak external, and still weaker internal evidence, as $\dot{u} \mu i v$ might have been easily suggested by a desire to conform to the v́ $\mu i \hat{\nu}$ in ver. $3 . \quad \epsilon i s \cdot \mathrm{X} \rho$. 'I $\eta \sigma_{\text {. }}$ ' unto Christ Jesus,' not merely ' in reference to Him,' but with a closor adherence to the primary force of the preposition, 'for the work of,' 'to the honor of,' 'erga Christum,' Erasm. (compare notes on ver. 5) ; ' bonum nobis exhibitum redundare debet in Christum,' Bengel. The words obviously belong to



7．$\chi$ apáv］So Lachm．and Tisch．ed．1，with ACDEFG； 10 mss．；apparently－all Vv．；Lat．Ff．（Griesb．，Scholz．，Mey．）．In edd． 2 and 7 Tisch．reads $\chi$ ápıv with KL ；great majority of mss．；Chrys．（ms．），Theod．，Dam．，Theoph．，al．（approved by Griesb．，and adopted by Alf．）．This latter reading has some little claim on our attention，on the principle＇proclivi lectioni prestat ardua，＇still as $\chi$ d́pıv might have been sucggested by the cùxapıб⿱亠䒑𧰨 which precedes，it does not appear safe to re－ verse so great a preponderance of uncial authority．

モ゙ $\sigma \chi \circ \nu]$ So Lachm．and Tisch．ed．1，with ACFG； 5 mss．；Vulg．，Copt．（ai－shi）， ※th．（Pol．and Platt），al．；Theod．；Lat．Ff．The plur．é $\sigma \chi o \mu \in \nu$ is found in D1E； Clarom．，Sang．；Hier．，al．（Meg．，Alf．）；the pres．єौХо $\neq \nu$（before $\pi 0 \lambda \lambda \eta \nu$ ）is found in $\mathrm{D}^{3} \mathrm{JK}$ ；great maj．of mss．；Syr．（both）；Chrys．，Dam．，Theoph．，al．，and adopted by Tisch．ed．2，7．At first sight the plural（St．Paul and Tim．，ver．1）would scem to be the true reading，of which the text was an alteration．As，however，the change might have been due to the preceding $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\nu} \nu$ ，we retain the best attested reading．
 precedes（Syr．，Vulg．，and more distinct－ ly With．（Platt），eis being assumed $=\langle\nu$ ）， still less to the more remote $\tau \hat{\eta} s \pi i \sigma \tau \epsilon \omega$ oov，as Grotius．Lachm．omits ${ }^{3}$ Inooûv with AC； 2 mss．；Copt．，庣th． （Polyb．，but not Platt）；Hier．，al．，but without sufficient external authority．

7．$\gamma$ d́p］It is somewhat doubtful whether this gives the（subjective）rea－ son for the eủxaptotia，ver． 4 （Jerome， Mey．），or for the prayer immediately preceding（De．W．，Alf．）．The latter is perhaps the most natural，as the subject of thanksgiving seems insensibly to have passed into that of prayer．The apostle prays that the кoเvшעia к．$\tau$ ．$\lambda$ ．may prove èveprク́s，for（＇sane rebus ita comparatis，＇ Klotz）it is at present so great as to cause joy both to himself and to Timo－
 érépous $\boldsymbol{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\nu} \nu \rho \mu$ év $\omega \nu$ ，Chrys．
ย $\sigma \not \subset \circ \nu$ ］＇$I$ had；＇scil．when I first heard of your $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \dot{\alpha} \pi \eta \nu$ and $\pi i \sigma \tau t \nu$, ver． 5. The тол入i $\nu$ ，as Meyer observes，appears to belong to both substantives；compare Jelf，Gr．§ 39．1．obs．
ध̇ $\pi$ l $\tau \hat{n} \dot{\alpha} \gamma \alpha \dot{\alpha} \pi \eta$ oov］＇in thy love；？ literally，＇based on thy love，＇$\quad$ e $\pi l$ with the dat．，as usual，marking the basis and
foundation upon which the xapà aud $\pi \alpha$－ рákл．rested；see notes on Phil．i． 3.
ठ̊ть $\tau \grave{\alpha} \sigma \pi \lambda \alpha \gamma \chi \nu a]$＇because the hearts；＇explanation of the preceding
 $\mu \eta \delta$ las öт $\pi a \nu \tau o \delta a \pi \eta े \nu ~ \tau o i ̂ s ~ a ́ \gamma l o t s ~ N ̀ \epsilon \rho \alpha-~$ $\pi \in!a \nu \pi \rho o \sigma \phi \epsilon ́ \rho \epsilon t s$ ，Theod．On the semi－ Hebraistic $\sigma \pi \lambda \alpha ́ \gamma \chi \nu \alpha$（ver．20， 2 Cor．vi． 12，al．），see notes on Phil．i． 8 ：there， however，the idea of＇affection＇（ $\pi \nu \in \nu$－ $\mu a t i к \grave{y}$ фıлобторүía，Theod．in loc．）is more predominant；here the term only serves to specify the imaginary seat of it；comp．Lücke on 1 John iii．17．As $\sigma \pi \lambda \alpha^{\gamma} \chi \vee a$ is a somewhat comprehensive term（＇proprie sunt viscera illa，nobiliora vocata，cor，pulmones，hepar et lien，＇ Tittmann，Synon．I．p．68），the ethical applications may obviously be somewhat varied ；see Suicer，Thesaur．s．v．Vol． I1．p．997．$\dot{\alpha} \cdot \nu \alpha \pi \epsilon \in \pi \nu \tau \alpha \iota]$ ＇have been refreshed；＇so 1 Cor．xvi．18， 2 Cor．vii．13．On the distinction be－ tween ává $\pi a v \sigma t s$ ，＇pause or cessation from labor，＇and $\alpha \nu \in \sigma t s$ ，＇relaxation of what had been tightly strained，＇see Trench，Synon．§．41．
$\dot{\alpha} \delta \in \lambda \phi \in$＇］Not＇Bruder in Wahrheit，＇ Do W．，Koch，but as 在th．，＇frater mi，＇ －in tones of earnest affection：＇hoc．in

I beseecli thee for Onesimus, thy once unprofitable servant, who left thee a servant, to return a brother : receive him as myself. If he be a defaulter, I will repay thee.
fine positum multum habet $\pi \alpha^{\prime}$ 'os; conf. Virg. EEn. vi. 836,' Scip. Gent.ap. Poli Syn.
8. $\delta \iota \delta$ '] 'On which account,' 'as I have so much joy and consolation in thee;' not in connection with $\pi \alpha \beta \hat{\beta}$. éx $\chi \nu \nu$ ( $\delta u-$
 बтєuкóть, Theod.) ,as Syr. and the Greek commentators, but in ref. to the preced-
 ing more fully the motive of the $\delta i \alpha$ á $\gamma$. $\mu$ âллоу тарак. which follows; so De Wette, Meyer, Alf. On the use of $\delta$ ob, see notes on Gal. iv. 31, and for its distinetion from oûv and $\swarrow_{\rho} \rho \alpha$, see Klotz, Devar. Vol. II. p. 373, but on the two latter particles contrast the more correct remarks of Donalds. Gram. § 604, Cratyl.
 'though I have boldness; ' concessive use of the simple participle, see Donaldson, Gram. § 621, and compare the remarks of Winer on the translation of participles, Gr. §46. 12, p. 413, -ed. 5, apparently omitted in ed. 6. On the meaning of $\pi \alpha \beta \beta .$, - here in its derivative sense of $\xi^{\xi} \xi o v \sigma i \alpha$, ă $\delta \epsilon \epsilon \alpha$, Hesych., see notes on 1 Tim. iii. 15. This $\pi \alpha \rho \rho \eta$ oia was ${ }^{e} \nu \mathrm{X} \rho$. ; He was the element in
 Chrys.) it was entertained, and out of which it did not exist: compare on Eph. iv. 1.

є̇ $\pi \iota \tau \alpha \sigma \sigma$. $\sigma 0 \iota \tau \delta$ aं $\nu \hat{\eta} \kappa \circ \quad \nu$ ] 'to enjoin upon thee that which is fitting ;' explanatory infin. following a phrase expressive of ability or capability ; compare Madvig, Synt. § 145. 1. The verb èmıтá $\sigma \sigma$. though not uncommon elsewhere in the N. T. is only found here in St. Paul's Epistles: $\in \pi เ \tau a \gamma \eta$, on the contrary, occurs seven times in these Epistles, but not elsewhere in the N. T. The neuter $\tau \delta$ ăv $\hat{\mu} \kappa \circ \nu$ (comp. Eph. v. 4, Col. iii. 18), not exactly $\tau \delta$ єis $\chi p \in i ́ a \nu \mu 0 \nu$
${ }^{\epsilon} \lambda \uparrow \sigma b$, Theoph., but more generically 'quod decet facere,' Coptic ? ? ${ }^{\text {? [illa quæ justa) Syr., } \tau \delta \text { трє́тov, }}$ Suid., marks the category (Meyer) to which the receiving back of Onesimus is to be referred.
9. $\delta \iota \grave{\alpha} \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \dot{\alpha} \gamma$.] 'on account of love,' 'for love's sake,' Auth. ; partially explanatory of the preceding $\delta \iota 6$, but with a more general reference, the dydam here
 or $\hat{\eta} \nu$ à $\gamma a \pi \hat{\omega} \tau \epsilon ́ \sigma \in \kappa \alpha l$ à $\gamma a \pi \hat{\omega} \mu \alpha \iota$, ©cum., nor even 'charitas tua in Christum,' Just., but, as the omission of all defining genitives seems to suggest, 'Christian love ' in its widest sense (De W., Mey.). The article gives the abstract noun its most generic meaning and application, Middleton, Gr. Art. v. 5. 1, p. 89 sq.
тolov̂tos $\check{6} \nu$ ] 'Being such an one,' 'As I am such an one,' scil. who would rather beseech for love's sake, than avail myself of my $\pi \alpha \dot{p} \rho \eta \sigma\{a \nu \quad \dot{e} \pi \iota \tau \alpha ́ \sigma \sigma \epsilon \iota \nu$. There is some little difficulty as to the connection of this participial clause. It is usually regarded as preparatory to the ©s חavinos which follows, and is conceived to more nearly explain it. Meyer, however (whose note on this clause is very persuasive), shows that the undefined rotồos, though often more nearly explained and defined by oios, $\Xi \sigma \tau \epsilon$, neither is, nor scarcely can be, associated with $\dot{\omega} s$, which naturally presumes a more defined antecedent, and always 'aptius conjungitur cum sequentibus,' Klotz, Devar. Vol. II. p 757. This being apparently the case, rotov̂ros $\omega \nu$ must be referred to ver. 8 , while $\dot{\omega}$ आaûdos $\pi \rho \in \sigma \beta v ́ \tau \eta s$, enhanced by $\nu v \nu l: \delta \grave{\epsilon}$ кal $\delta \epsilon \in \sigma-$ $\mu$ mos'I. X., belongs to the second $\pi$ apa$\kappa \alpha \lambda \omega \hat{\omega}$ (so Lachm., De Wette, and recently Buttm., Alf.), and states the capacity in


9. 'I $\eta \sigma o \hat{v} \mathrm{X} \rho \iota \sigma \tau o \hat{\nu}]$ So Rec. with $\mathrm{D}^{2} \mathrm{D}^{3} \mathrm{EFGKL}$; apparently great majority of mss. ; Vulg., Clarom., Syr., Eth. (Platt), al. ; Chrys., Theod. Luchm. and Tisch. reverse the order with AC ; a few mss. ; Copt., Æth. (Pol.), Iber., al. The evi-- dence does not seem sufficient to justify the reversed order, especially as the best authorities give $\mathrm{X} \rho$. ' $I \eta \sigma$. in ver. 1 , which might easily have suggested the correction.
which the apostlo makes his affectionate request. Lachn. it may be observed encloses $\dot{\omega} s$ Пaî̀os in a parenthesis ; Buttm. isolates it by commas (so Chrys., ảmठ

 סéбulos к. т. 入., compare Eth. [Platt]) ; both however unsatisfactorily: Пav̂גos seems more naturally to stand in immedate union with $\pi \rho \in \sigma \beta \dot{\tau} \eta \eta \mathrm{s}$ (Syr., Copt.) and to hint at the title he might have assumed, 'Paul the Apostle.'
$\pi \rho \in \sigma \beta v \tau \eta s$ ] 'an aged man,' Auth., 'senex,' Vulg. ${ }^{\circ}{ }^{\circ} 0$ Syriac and appy. all $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{V}}$. It is quite unnecessary to attempt to explain away the simple meaning of this word ('non ætatem sed officium significat,' Calvin, 'ein Senior der Christenheit,' Koch), or to evade the almost obvious reference to age ; see Wolf in loc. If with Wieseler we assume as late a year as A.D. 39 for the martyrdom of Stephen, and consider the $\nu \in a \nu i a s$ at that time as no more that 25 or 26 , the apostle would now (probably A. D. 62) be nearly 50 , which, broken as he was with labor, suffering, and anxieties (2 Cor. xii. 24-28), might well entitle him to the appellation of $\pi \rho \in \sigma \beta \dot{v} \tau \eta s$. If wंe follow the tradition in Pseud.-Chrys. Oral. de Petr. et Paulo (Vol. viri. spur. p. 10, ed. Bened.), that St. Paul's age was 68 when he suffered martyrdom, there will remain no doubt as to the appropriateness of the term. All attempts, however, to fix the year in which St. Paul was born seem hopeless; compare

Winer, $R$ WB. Vol. Ir. p. 217.
$\delta \epsilon ́ \sigma \mu \iota 0$ s 'I. X.] Not $\delta \iota \iota \times \mathrm{X} \rho \iota \sigma \tau \delta \nu \nu \delta \in \delta € \mu \epsilon$ ' vos, Chrys., but, as in ver. 1, 'one whom Christ and his cause have bound;' see notes above, and Winer, Gr. § 30. 2, p. 170.
10. тồ Eُ $\mu \mathrm{o}$ र̂ Tध́Kעov] 'my own child;' with tender reference to Philemon as being converted by the apostle, and owving to him his Christian existence ; compare 1 Cor. iv. 14, Gal. iv. 19, and Loesner, Obs. p. 431, who cites the partially parallel $\mu a ̂ \lambda \lambda o \nu$ aủtò $\nu \hat{\eta}$ oủ $\chi$
 §8, Vol. 11. p. 554 (ed. Mang.). The pronoun ${ }^{\epsilon} \mu 0 \hat{v}$ seems here emphatic. Lachm. and Meyer introduce é $\gamma \omega$ ف before é $\gamma \epsilon \in \nu \nu \eta \sigma$, but though on internal grounds not improbable, the external authority [A; 2 mss.; Slav. (ms.), Chrys. (1)] does not seem nearly sufficient to warrant the insertion.

द̀ $\nu$ тoîs $\left.\delta \in \sigma \mu_{0} \hat{\imath} s\right]$ With feeling allusion to the circumstances in which he was when Philemon was converted, and in which he now is again while urging his re-
 orandi vim habent], Chrys. The addition $\mu 0 \hat{u}$ after $\delta \in \sigma \mu \circ$ is [Rec., Scholz, with $\mathrm{CD}^{3} \mathrm{KL}$; al.] seems rightly rejected by Lachm. and Tisch.
'O $\nu \dot{n} \sigma \iota \mu \circ \nu$ ] Accusative, owing to an inverted form of attraction ; the relative which would more usually (compare Winer, Gr. § 24.1, p. 147) have been in the same gender and case as $\tau$ ćkvou hero follows the common regimen, passing into the gender of the latter substantive,



11．à $\nu \in ́ \pi \epsilon \mu \psi \alpha ́$ бoı］So Lachmann and Tischen．1，with ACDיD；17；Syr．，Copt． （ha－pok），Sith．（1，oth）；Chrys．（ $\pi \rho \rho \rho_{s} \sigma \epsilon$ ）；Lat．Ff．（Meyer）．In his second edition Tisch．omits $\sigma 0$ with DPFGKL ；nearly all mss．；Amit．，Fuld．，Goth．，Syr．（Phi－ lox．）；many Ff．（Rec．Alf．）．Independently of external authority which seems to preponderate against the omission，it does not seem improbable that $\sigma o \iota$ should have been omitted on account of the two preceding repetitions in the same verse，and the $\sigma \grave{v} \delta \in$ which immediately follows．
and attracting it into its own case ；see Winer，Gram．§ 24．2，p．149，§66．5，p． 552.

11．$\tau \delta \nu \pi о \tau \epsilon \in$ бot ¿̌ $\chi \rho$ ．］＇who was once unprofitable，＇＇unserviceable，＇scil． who once did not answer to his name （oे $\quad \eta \sigma \mu \mu \nu$ ），but by running away，and apparently also by theft（Chrys．on ver． $18)$ ，proved himself ${ }^{\circ} \chi \rho \eta \sigma \tau o s$ ．The word

 defined by Tittm．（Synon．11，p．12）as ＇quo uti recte non possumus，＇＇qui nul－ lum usum prebeat．＇The distinction be－ tween this and expeios（Matth．xxv．30， Luke xvii．10）is not very palpable ：per－ haps the latter rather implies oยิ oủk ĕ ẽt $\chi \rho \in(\alpha$, ，quo non opus est＇（Tittm．），＇one who could be dispensed with，＇and hence， inferentially，＇worthless，＇à $\chi$ рєîov kal àv $\omega$－ $\phi \in \lambda \epsilon$＇s，Xen．Mem．1．2．54，while ä $\chi \rho \eta$－ $\sigma \tau o s$ has less of a negative sense（oủ $\chi \rho \eta$ ク－ $\sigma(\mu \nu \nu)$ and more approximates to that of тovnpós．It would seem，however，that à $\chi p \in i o s$ belongs mainly to earlier，áap $\eta$－ $\sigma$ tos mainly to later Greek．The play on the name，＇ $\mathrm{O} \nu \dot{\prime} \sigma \tau \mu \circ \nu, \tau \delta \nu \quad \pi о \tau$＇ áxpクotov（not noticed by the Greek com－ mentators），has been recognized by the majority of expositors；see Winer，Gr． § 68．2，p．561．Any further allusion， Xpクotos as compared with Xpıotıavós （Koch），seems improbable and even un－ tenable，compare Mey．in loc．
 viceable，to thee and to me．＇The euxpm－ бria here alluded to has obviously a
higher reference than to merely earthly service（comp．Chrys．）：Philemon had now gained in his servant a brother in the faith；St．Paul，one who owed him his hope of future salvation，and was a living proof that he had not run in vain． In the delicately added $\epsilon \mu \mathrm{l}$ ）（Philemo－ nem oiviliter præponit sibi，＇Beng．）it is somewhat coarse（Theoph．，Corn．a Lap．）to find a hint that Philemon was to send him back to the apostle．On the various beauties and persuasive touches in this exquisite Epistle，see Marshall （Nath．），Serm．xirr．Vol．Ir．p．327．sq． （Lond．1731）．
$8 \nu$ à $\nu$ é－ $\pi \in \mu \psi$ á $\sigma 0$ t］＇I have sent back to thee，＇ or even＇I send back，etc．，＇－epistolary aor．；present to the writer，but aoristic to the receiver of the letter；compare € $\pi \epsilon \mu \psi a$ ，Phil．ii． 28 ，and see examples in Winer，Gr．§ 40.5 .2, p． 249.

12．$\sigma$ ò $\delta$＇̀ $\alpha$ v̉ $\tau \delta \nu$ ］＇But do thou （receive）him．＇The sentence involves an anacoluthon，which，however，affords but little difficulty，as ver．17，in which the construction is resumed，suggests the natural supplement．The addition mpor－ $\lambda a \beta o u$［Rec．with CDEKL；al．］is well attested，but considering the tendency of St．Paul，esp．in relatival sentences，to pass into anacolutha（see examples in Winer，Gr．§63．1，p．500），rightly re－ jected by Lachm．，Tisch．，and most mod－ ern expositors as an ancient gloss．Lach－ mann also omits où $\delta$ é［with $\mathrm{AC} ; 17$ ］， but with little probability，as the omis－ sion was apparently the result of an at－


tempt to evade the anacoluthon by joining àvé $\pi \epsilon \mu \psi \dot{\psi}$ and $\alpha u ̉ x \delta \nu^{\prime}$; comp. Meyer (crit. note), p: 173.
$\tau \dot{\alpha}$ $\left.\epsilon \not \epsilon \alpha{ }_{\alpha} \sigma \pi \lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha} \gamma \nu a\right]$ 'mine own heart,' ' meinos brusts,' Goth. ; ou゙rw $\gamma$ àp aủ $\delta \delta \nu$


The meaning adopted by Syriac $\left.\sim\right|_{\Delta}$ S, io is? [sicut natum meum],灰thiopic (Platt; Polygl. paraphrases),
 $\nu \omega \nu$, al., though perfectly defensible (see Suicer, Thesaur. s. v., and the pertinent examples in Wetstein); does not here seem requisite or indeed satisfactory, as the paternal relation of St. Paul to Onesimus was a purely spiritual one, and as $\sigma \pi \lambda d^{\gamma} \chi \nu \alpha$ appears nearly always in St. Paul to involve some special idea of affection, or, as here, of the seat of it: Meyer (after Grot.) quotes ' meum corculum,' Plaut. Cas. Iv. 4.14 (16) : compare notes on ver. 7.
13. є่ $\gamma \grave{\omega}$ '̇ $\beta$ ov $\lambda \delta \mu \eta \nu$ ] ' $I$ (on my
 ver. 14 , where not only the general distinction between the verbs $\beta$ oú $\lambda о \mu a l$ and จิ่่́ $\omega$ (see notes on 1 Tim. v. 14), but, as Meyer remarks, between the tenses, is accurately preserved. The imperfect points to the time when the design was formed, and to its non-fulfilment ; compare Bernhardy, Synt. x. 3, p. 373. The use of $\eta$ ข̉ $\chi \delta \mu \eta \nu$ Rom. ix. 3 (Alf.) though analogous, is not exactly similar, as this belongs to a use of the imperfect where there is a more distinct reference to a suppressed conditional clause ; see notes on Gal. $\nabla .20$.
$\pi \rho \partial s$
$\left.\epsilon^{\epsilon} \mu a v \tau \delta \nu\right]$ 'with myself;' the proper and primary meaning of the preposition (' motion toward,' compare Donaldson, Cratyl. § 169) is often obscured in con-
nection with persons; see notes on Gal. i. 18, and Winer, Gr. § 49 . h, p. 360. $\dot{v} \pi \grave{\epsilon} \rho \sigma \circ \hat{v}]$. 'in thy stead; ' not simply for a a $\nu \tau \ell$, but with a tinge of the more usual meaning of the preposition 'in the place of, and thereby beneficially to thee; ' compare Eurip. Alcest. 700, катNิaveiv úmèp $\sigma o \hat{v}_{,}$and see Green, Gram. p. 301. This more derivative meaning of the prep. cannot be denied (see Winer, Gr. §47. 1, p. 342), but has been unduly pressed in doctrinal passages ; compare notes on Gal. iii. 13, and Usteri, Lehrob. 11. 1.1, p. 115. The exquisite turn that St. Paul gives to his intention of retaining Onesimus, viz. as a representative of
 tion тठ $\chi \rho$ éos, Theod.), should not be left unnoticed. $\delta \iota \alpha \kappa \circ \nu \hat{\eta}]$ 'might minister;' present, idiomatically referring to the time when the ${ }^{2} \beta o u \lambda \delta^{\prime} \mu \eta \nu$ took place, and giving a vividness to the past by representing it as present ; see Winer, Gr. § 41.\%. 1, p. 258, and Klotz, Devar. Vol. II. p. 618: compare also Gal. i. 16, but observe that the use of the present is somewhat different; there an event is referred to which was still going on, here the $\delta$ taкоvia, in its more direct sense, had now ceased, as Onesimus was all but on his way home to his master. $\delta \in \sigma \mu \circ \hat{\imath} s \tau 0 \hat{v} \in \dot{u} \alpha \gamma \gamma$.] 'bonds of the gospel;' scil. 'bonds which the gospel brought with it, - which preaching the gospel entailed on me,' єjary being a gen. auctoris; see Winer, Gr. § 30.2. $\beta$. note, p. 170, Hartung, Casus, p. 17. Again a delicate allusion to his sufferings (comp. v. 9), and to a state which could not fail to touch the heart of Philemon.
14. $\chi \omega \rho$ 's $\delta$ è к. $\tau . \lambda_{\text {.] }}$ 'but without thy own approval :' comp. Raphel, Annot. Yol. II. p. 642, who very appropriately cites Polybius, Hist. p. 983 (xv. 18, 4),



 III．21．7，$\chi \omega \rho \backslash \stackrel{\tau}{ } \tau \hat{\eta} s ~ a u ̉ \tau o v ̂ ~ \gamma \nu \omega ́ \mu \eta s, ~ i b . ~$
 in Schweigh．Lex．Polyb．p．89）．Г Г $\omega$ и $\eta$ occurs a few times in the N．T．，and in slightly varied senses；comp．Acts xx． 3 ，where it has apparently the stronger sense of＇design，＇and 1 Cor．i．10，vii． $25,40,2$ Cor．viii． 20 ，where it has its more regular meaning of＇sententia＇or ＇judicium；＇compare Meyer on 1 Cor． i：10，and Kypke，Obs，Vol．Ir．p． 205.认ुへิต́ $\eta \boldsymbol{\sigma} \alpha$ ］＇was willing；＇aor．，see notes on ver． $13 . \quad \dot{\omega} s \kappa \alpha \tau$ む $\dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha \gamma \kappa \eta \nu]$＇as if by necessity，＇＇compul－ sion－wise；＇the кatà marking primarily the norma or manner according to which the action was done（see notes on Titus iii． 5 ），and thence the prevailing princi－ ple to which it was to be referred（comp． examples in Winer，Gr．§49．d，p．358）， while $\dot{\omega}$ marks the aspect which the ac－ tion would have worn；see Bernhardy， Synt．vir．2，p．333，and notes on Eph． v．22，Col．iii．23．Chrysost．，and more fully Theophyl．and Ecum．，rightly call attention to this insertion of the particle． $\tau \delta$ àraș $\delta \nu \sigma o \nu]$＇thy good，＇＇thy be－ neficence，＇＇the good emanating from or performed by thee，＇－the gen．perhaps being not so much a mere possessive gen．as a gen．auctoris or causce efficien－ tis；see notes on Col．i．23．The exact meaning of the words is slightly doubt－ ful；there seems certainly no reference to any manumission of Onesimus（Es－ tius，Koch ；contrast Maurice，Unity of N．T．p．659），nor merely to the kind reception which Philemon was to give him on his arrival（Hofmann，Schriftb． Vol．Ir．p．387），nor even to the＇benefi－ cium＇which in this particular instance Philemon was to confer on the apostle， but，as the more abstract term suggests，
＇beneficentia tua＇（Calv．），whether as shown in this or in other good and merci－ ful acts generally．If the apostle had retained Onesimus，Philemon would have doubtless consented，but the $\tau \delta$ á $\gamma a ⿱ 龴 \delta \nu \nu$ in the particular case would have worn the appearance（ $\dot{\omega}$ ）of a kind of constraint； St．Paul，however，wished，as in this so in all other matters，that Philemon＇s $\tau \delta$
 д̀ $\lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha}$ кatà érov́rtov．On the doubtful distinction in the N．T．between $\tau \delta ~ \grave{\alpha} \gamma a \hat{\delta} \dot{\nu}$ and $\tau \delta \kappa \alpha \lambda \delta \dot{\nu}$ ，see notes on Gal．vi． 10.
 ＇voluntarily．＇The more usual periphra－ sis for the adverb appears in the earlier Greek to have been $\kappa a \vartheta^{\circ}$ érova！$\alpha \nu$ ，Thu－
 Trach．724，by an ellipse of $\gamma \nu \omega \mu \eta$ ．In the present case there may have been originally an ellipse of тоómov（Porphyr．
 expression，however，would soon become purely adverbial ：comp．Lobeck，Phryn． p． 4.

15．$\tau$ á $\chi a \quad \gamma$ áp］＇For perhaps ；＇rea－ son that influenced the apostle in send－ ing back Onesimus．The inscrtion of $\tau \alpha ́ \chi \alpha$（Rom．v． 7 ；more usually $\tau \alpha \chi^{2} \not \alpha^{2} \nu$ ， in classical Greek）gives a softening and suasive turn to the admission of his con－ vert＇s fault，no less sound in principle （＇occulta sunt judicia Dei，et temera－ rium est quasi de certo pronunciare quod dubium est，＇Hieron．）than judicious in its present use ；$\kappa \alpha \lambda \omega \hat{s} \tau \delta, \tau \alpha \alpha^{\prime} \alpha, ף \nu \alpha$ є $i \xi \xi \hat{\eta}$

 and Jerome admirably illustrate from the history of Joseph the great feature of the providential government of God which these verses disclose，－＇prresta－ bilius ducere Deum de malis bona facere， quam mala nulla facere，＇Justin．in loc．，

see August. Enchir. § 3, Vol. vi. p. 349 (cd. Ben. 1836).
' $\chi \omega \rho!\sigma \geqslant \eta]$ 'he departed;' he does not say é $\phi u \gamma \epsilon \nu$ lest he should rouse up any angry remembrances in the mind of Philem. : so Chrys., Ecum., and Theophyl. all of whom have admirably illustrated the delicate touches in this beautiful Ep. For examples of this sort of 'medialpassive,' in which, however, not only the passive form, but passive meaning, is clearly to be recognized, see Krüger, Sprachl. § 52. 6. 1.
т $\rho \delta \delta_{s} \dot{\omega} \rho a \nu$ ] 'for a season;' 2 Corin. vii. 8 , Gal. ii. 5 , and more definitely 1
 present expression the duration of the time is not expressly stated, but it may be inferred from the antithesis to have not been very long; compare Theophyl. in loc. The proper force of the prep. (' motion towards ') may be casily recognized in the formula, especially when compared with its more appreciable force in such expressions as $\pi \rho \partial{ }_{\mathrm{s}} \mathrm{e} \dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \in \rho a y$ (Luke xxiv. 29), al. ; compare Bernhardy, Synt. v. 31, p. 564. The derivation of $\mathscr{L}_{p}$ a is uncertain; it has been connected with the Sanscr. vâra, 'time' (Benfey, Wurzellex. Vol. II. p. 328), but, perhaps more probably, with the Zend. jare, Germ. 'Jahr,' as apparently ovinced in the Lat. 'horno ;' compare Pott, Etym. Forsch. Vol. x. p. 8, 123.
aíuvเov aù $\bar{\delta} \nu \quad$ à $\pi$.] 'mightest receive him eternally, everlastingly,' not merely 'perpetuum,' Beza (Grot. compares Hor. Epist. 1. 10.41, 'serviet æternum'), nor with any allusion to 'perpetua mancipia,' Exodus xxi. 6, Deut. xv. 17 (Beza, Gent.), but 'in æternum,' Clarom., 'aiveinana,' Goth. ; oùk $̇$ '̀ $\tau \hat{\varphi}$


 50 pertinently Estius, 'servitus omnis
hâc vitâ finitur, at fraternitas Christiana manet in eternum.' The tertiary predicate of time, aiévtov, is not an adverb (Mey.), hut, as its position suggests, an adverbial adjective involving a proleptical statement of the result ; comp. Donalds. Gr. § 489 sq., and see examples in Winer, Gr. §54. 2, p. 412.

On
the compound á $\pi \in \in \chi \in \epsilon \nu$, in which, as in
 apparently so much mark the 'receiving back,' as the 'having for one's own' ('sibi habere,' Bengel, 'hinweghaben,' Mey.), see notes on Phil. iv. 18, comp. Winer, Verb. Comp. Iv. p. 8.
 spiritual relation in which he now would stand to his master ; $\omega \sigma \tau \epsilon \kappa$ ка̀ $\tau \hat{\varphi}$ Хро́vఱ
 particle és almost convincingly shows that there is here no reference to manumission (comp. on ver. 14) : though actually a slave, he is not to be regarded in the ordinary aspect of one (see verse 14) ; the inward relation was changed, the outward remained the same ; comp. Hofmann, Schriftb. Vol. ir. 1, p. 318.
$\dot{v} \pi \epsilon \rho \delta o \hat{v} \lambda o \nu]$. 'above a slave, more than a slave,' 'ufar skalk,' Gothic, $\leftarrow_{0}-\frac{\Delta_{x}}{\square}$ [præstantior quam], Syr., sim. 乍th. (Platt), Copt. ; not 'pro servo,' Vulg., Clarom., which obscures the force of the preposition ; compare Matth. x. 24, 37, Acts xxvi. 13, in which the force of $v \pi \dot{\epsilon} \rho$ is somewhat similar, and see Winer, Gr. §49. c, p. 359. The expression is explained by the following à $\delta \in \lambda \phi \partial \nu$ à $\gamma a \pi \eta \tau \delta \nu$; Onesimus was not now to be regarded in the light of a slave, but in a higher light, viz. as a be-


$\mu \alpha ́ \lambda \iota \sigma \tau a \quad$ '̇ $\mu 0$ ! $]$ 'especially, above all others, to me;' not directly dependent on á. $\gamma a \pi \eta \tau \delta \nu$ (Meyer), but, as ả $\gamma a \pi \eta \tau d s_{\text {_ }}$ in


the $\mathrm{N} . \mathrm{T}$. has to a great degree lost its verbal character, a dative ' of interest' (Krüger, Sprachl. § 43. 4) attached to à $\delta \epsilon \lambda \phi$. ả $\gamma a \pi$.; comp. Syr., Bengel. He stood in the light of an $\dot{\alpha} \delta \in \lambda \phi$. $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \alpha \pi$, to St. Paul, whom he had now left, but much more so to Philemon, who had formerly known him as a mere $\delta 0 \hat{\nu} \lambda o \nu$, but who was now to have him as his own in a higher and closer relation than before. On the meaning and derivation of $\mu \dot{\alpha} \lambda \iota \sigma \tau \alpha$, compare notes on 1 Tim. iv. 10.

каl є่ $\nu$ таркі к.т. 入.] 'both in the flesh and in the Lord;' the two spheres in which Onesimus was to
 Philemon than to the apostle, - 'in the flesh,' i. c. in earthly and personal relations (Mey.), as having intercourse and communication with him on a necessarily somewhat altered footing; - 'in the Lord,' as enjoying spiritual communion with him which he had never enjoyed before, - nearly kal èv raîs $\sigma \omega \mu a \tau$ нкaîs
 Schol., except that the idea must not be limited to int $\quad \rho \in \sigma i a$; compare Theod., ©ecum. To define $\epsilon^{\xi} \nu \sigma \alpha \rho \kappa \ell$ more nearly (comp. Grot., al.) is neither here necessary nor in harmony with the general use of the word in St. Paul's Epistles ; see notes on Galat. v. 16, and the claborate notes of Koch, p. $99 \mathrm{sq}$. ; 'dic Gcgensätze, als Mensch und als Christ sind in ihrer ganzen Weite zu belassen,' Mey. On the force of kal-rai (' as well the one as the other'), see notes on I Tim. iv. 10.
17. є $\mathfrak{i}$ o $\bar{\nu} \nu$ ] 'If then;' summing up what has been urged, and resuming the request imperfectly expressed in ver. 12. On the 'vis collectiva' of oüv (Gal. iv. 15, Phil. ii. 29, see notes) and its resumptive force (Galat. iii. 5 , see notes), both here united, see Klotz, Devar. Vol.
II. pp. 717, 718.

кolv $\omega \nu$ ó $\nu$ ] ' a partner,' scil. in faith, and love, and Christian principles generally, - not merely in sentiments ( $\epsilon \hat{i}$ т $\alpha$ aúvód $\mu 0 \iota$ фроveîs, è $\pi l$ тoîs aùroîs тpé $\chi \in \iota s$, єi фí̉ov invn̂, Chrys., Just.), or, still less likely, in community of property (' $u t$ tua sint mea, et mea tua,' Beng., comparc Beza, Pagn.), interpretations which here improperly limit what seems purposely left unrestricted.
$\pi \rho \circ \sigma \lambda \alpha \beta \circ \hat{v}$ ©s $\left.{ }^{\circ}{ }^{\circ} \mu \epsilon\right]$ 'receive him to thee as myself;'. 'as you would me;' in my spiritual affection towards him he is a part of my very self, compare ver. 12 . The form $\pi \rho o \sigma \lambda a \mu \beta$. occurs in a very similar sense, Rom. xiv. $1,3, \mathrm{xv} .7$, the idea not being so much of a mere kindness of reception (compare Acts xxviii. 2) as of an admission to Christian love and fellowship; sce Meyer on Rom. xiv. 1, and Fritz. in loc., who, however, in his translation ' in suum contubernium recipere,' somewhat puts out of sight the Christian character of the reception which the context scems to imply.
18. $\epsilon i \delta \epsilon$ ] 'But iff;' contrasted thought (comp. Alf.), suggested by the remembrance of what might militate against the warmth of the reception. The $\delta \frac{1}{\epsilon}$ thus does not seem $\mu \in \tau \alpha \beta a \tau \iota 反 \delta \nu$ (Mey.), but preserves its usual oppositive force ; 'qui loquitur, etiam si nihil positum est in oratione tamen aliquid in mente habet, ad quod respiciens illam oppositionem infert,' Klotz, Devar. Vol. II. p. $365 . \quad \hat{\eta} \delta\left\{\kappa \eta \sigma^{\prime} \nu, \sigma \epsilon\right.$ ] 'wronged thee,' more specifically explained by the 'mitius synonymon.' (Beng.) \#) ö $\phi \epsilon$ í $\lambda \epsilon$ ı. The Greek commentators draw attention to the tender way in which St. Paul notices that misdeed of the repentant Onesimus, which must have tended most to keep up the irrita-


 oph.), and further, the kind and wise way in which he keeps it to the end of

 тоиิтou троєıтєîv, Chrys.

 ö $\phi \in i \lambda \epsilon t$; 'id meis rationibus imputa,' Grot. Though there is no certain lexical authority for ${ }^{\epsilon} \lambda \lambda 0 \gamma^{d} \omega$ (it does not appear in the new ed. of Steph. Thesaur.), and though its existence has been somewhat peremptorily denied (Fritz. Rom. v. 13, Vol. I. p. 311), yet still as the desiderative лoyá (Lucian, Lexiph. § 15) is an acknowledged form, and as peculiarities of orthography or errors of transcription cannot be made satisfactorily to account for the assumed permutation of $\epsilon t$ and a [Bastius ap. Greg. Cor. p. 706 (ed. Schæf.) cited by Fritz. is not in point, as here referring to cursive mss. ; see examples and plates referred to] we seem bound to follow the preponderant uncial authority, ACD1FG; 17.31: so Lachm., Tisch., and also Meyer, Alf.
 have written ;' scarcely 'I write,' De W., Conyb., Green (Gr. p. 17), as this epistolary aorist in the N. Test. does not appear used simply in reference to what follows, but always more or less retrospectively, whether in reference to a former letter ( 2 Cor. ii. 3), to proceding passages in an all but concluded letter (Rom. xv. 15, see Meyer in loc.), or to an immediately foregoing portion of one in progress ( 1 Cor. ix. 15): when the reference is to what is definitely present, the simple $\gamma$ pá $\phi \omega$ is used in preferenco to the idiomatic aorist; see Winer, Gram. §40. 5. 2, p. 249, and notes on Gal. vi. 11. This would lead us to conclude that St. Paul wrote with his own hand certainly the preceding verse, and not
improbably (Theod., Hieron.) the whole Epistle. It does not thus seem desirablo with Lachm. and Buttm. to make this verse the commencement of a new paragraph.

'I will repay,' obviously not with any serious meaning, as if the apostle expected that Philemon would demand it, but, as the Greek commentators all observe, रaptévjws (Theoph.), yet, perhaps, as the next words convey, with a gracefully implied exhortation, каl '̇ $\pi \iota \tau \rho \in \pi \tau \iota \iota \omega \bar{s}$ ä $\mu a$ кal хaptévicus (Chrys.) ; comp. Theod.,
 $\lambda \eta \eta^{\prime} \nu$ тâ$\sigma a \nu ~ a u ̉ \tau \eta ̀ \nu ~ \epsilon ̇ \gamma \omega े ~ \gamma \epsilon ́ \gamma p a \phi \alpha . ~ T h e ~$ addition $̇ \nu$ K Kupí $\left[\mathrm{D}^{1} \mathrm{E}^{1}\right.$; Claromanus, Sang.] is an improbable repetition of $\epsilon \nu$ Kupíu below. $\quad$ Iva $\mu \dot{\eta} \lambda \in ́ \gamma \omega$ бor] 'that I may not say to thee;' a rhe-
 Grot., or $\pi \alpha \rho a \lambda \epsilon i \psi \in \omega s$, Gent., ' rhetorica proteritio,' Est., - in which what might be said is partially suppressed, or only delicately brought to the remembrance of the person addressed. The qua does not seem strictly dependent on é $\gamma \rho a \psi a$, on àтоті́б (Меу.), nor yet on a suppressed imper. 'yield me this request' (Alford), - which would impair the graceful flow of thought, but rather, as Chrys., Theoph., and CEcum. seem to suggest, on a thought called up by the ámoriow, - 'repay ; yes I say this, not doubting thee, but not wishing to press on thee the claim I might justly urge :' all was to be oủ
 14. $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \circ \phi \in\{\lambda \in \iota s$ ] ' thou owest unto me besides :' Philemon was not only an actual debtor to the apostle of any trifle that he thus ( $\mu \in \tau \grave{\alpha}$ Хápitos $\tau \hat{\eta} s$ $\pi \nu \in \nu \mu a \tau i \kappa \eta ิ s$, Chrysost.) offers to make good, but in addition to it ( $\pi \rho 0 \sigma-$ ), even (kal ascensive) his own self, his own Christian existence. Raphel adduces somewhat similar uses of $\pi \rho 0 \sigma 0 \phi \epsilon i \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \nu$ in Xen. Cyr. III. p. 59 (III. 2. 16), Eicon.

 $\pi a v \sigma o ́ v ~ \mu o v ~ \tau a ̀ ~ \sigma \pi \lambda a ́ \gamma \chi \nu a ~ є ่ \nu ~ X \rho \iota \sigma \tau ஸ ̨ . ~ . ~$

I am contident that thou wilt fully comply with my request. Prepare me a lodging.


p. 684 (20. 1) ; the meaning, however, is sufficiently obvious. A curious metaphorical use of $\pi \rho o \sigma o \phi$. ('longe inferiorem esse ') will be found in Polyb. Hist. xxxix. 2. 6 .
20. $\nu a\{$ 亿, à $\delta \in \lambda \phi \epsilon$ '] 'yea, brother ;' certainly not 'precantis' (Grot.), nor 'vehementer obsecrantis' (Gent.), but with the usual force of the partiele in the N. Test., 'serio affirmantis' (compare Erasm.), in reference to the request em-

 $\sigma \pi o v \delta a i l \omega \nu$, Chrys., compare Theoph. and ©ecum. On the use of val in the N. T., see notes on Phil. iv. 3.
'े $\gamma \boldsymbol{\omega}$ oov b̀va\{ $\mu \eta \nu$ ] ‘may $I$ reap profit from thee ; $-I$, not without emphasis ; the apostle again (comp. ver. 12, 17) makes it a matter between himself and Philemon, putting for the time Onesimus almost out of sight; it was a favor to himself. The somerwhat unusual bvar$\mu \eta \nu$ [2 aor. opt., see Buttm. Irreg. Verls, p. 189 Transl.], coupled with the significant ${ }^{2} \gamma \dot{\text { c }}$ ( $I$, not merely Ones.), seems to confirm the view of most modern commentt., except De W., that there is again a play on the name of Onesimus; see Winer, Gr. § 68. 2, p. 561. The form obvaí$\mu \eta \nu$ is similarly used by Ignatius (Polyc. 1. 6, Magn. 12, al.), - once (Ephes. 2) curiously enough, but apparently by mere accident, after a mention of an Onesimus. $\quad \dot{\epsilon} \nu \mathrm{K} v \rho\{\omega$ denotes, as usual, the sphere of the övors, (see on Ephes. iv. 17, Phil. ii. 19, al.),
 fies that of the àvátavots; both were to be characterized by being in Him, they were to be such as implied His hallowing
influences. It may be here observed that ${ }_{i} \nu \mathrm{X} \rho$. has distinctly preponderating authority $\left[\mathrm{ACD}_{1} \mathrm{FGL}\right.$; al.; Claroman., Syr. (both), Neth. (both), Copt., Goth.], and is adopted by nearly all modern eds. $\tau$ à $\sigma \pi \lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha} \gamma \chi \nu a \mid$ ' $m y$ heart ;' not Onesimus, as in v. 12 (Hieron.), which would here be wholly out of place, nor $\tau \grave{\eta} v$ $\pi \in \rho i t \in d$ d̀dá $\pi \eta \nu$ (Theoph., ©cum.), but simply the $\sigma \pi \lambda a^{\prime} \gamma \chi \nu a$ of the apostle, the seat of his love and affections ; seo notes on ver. 7.
21. $\pi \in \pi 0 \mathfrak{\imath} \dot{\omega} s \tau \hat{\eta} \dot{\delta} \pi a \kappa_{\text {. }}$ ] Concluding allusion to his apostolic authority, but how delicately introduced, how tenderly deferred, and how encouragingly eeloing the commendations with which


 Eypaษa] 'I have written,' not 'I write,' De W.; see above on ver. 19, and contrast the following present.
$\dot{\delta} \pi \bar{\varepsilon} \rho \hat{\delta} \lambda \epsilon \in \gamma \omega]$ ' beyond what $I$ am say. ing;' compare Eph. iii. 20. It is very doubtful whether this alludes, however faintly, to the manumission of Onesimus (Alf.). The tenor of the Epistle would seem to imply nothing more than encouraging confidence on the part of the
 Chrys.), that Philemon would show to the fugitive even greater kindness and a more affectionate reception than he had pleaded for; compare notes on ver. 14 and 16. Lachm. here reads $\dot{v} \pi \mathrm{e}_{\rho}$ \& with AC; 3 mss. ; Coptic, Syr. (Philox.), not without some reason, as the single request might have suggested the correction (compare Alford) ; still it is perhaps more safe to retain the text



 ovveproí $\mu$ ov.
Benedicition. $\quad{ }^{25}$ ' $H$ Xápıs тô̂ Kvpíov í $\mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ 'I $\eta \sigma o v ̂ ~ X \rho \iota \sigma \tau o v ̂ ~ \mu \epsilon \tau \grave{a}$ тồ $\pi \nu \epsilon \dot{v} \mu a \tau o s ~ \dot{v} \mu \omega ̂ \nu$.
as best supported by external authority.
22. ä $\mu a<\delta$ ह̀ кal к. T. 入.] ' Moreover at the same time also provide me a lodging;' a commission appended to his request : in addition to complying with the subject of the letter, Philemon was also to make this provision for the expected apostle. Chrys. and Theod. (compare Alf.) find in this message a last thought of Onesimus, and a direction tending to secure him a kind reception; qua $\pi \rho \rho \sigma-$
 кal $\tau \grave{~ c}$ रрápuata, Theod. It may be doubted, however, whether the first view of Theoph. and ©cumen. is not more probable, and more worthy both of Philemon and of the apostle, - viz., that Philemon was not to consider the Epistle a mere petition for Onesimus ( $\epsilon i \mu \grave{\eta}$
 oph.), but as containing special messages on other matters to himself. The word
 occurs here and, also in reference to Șt. Paul, Acts xxviii. 23.
$\delta \iota \grave{~} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \rho \sigma \sigma \in \nu \chi \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\delta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu]$ through your prayers :' in reference to Philemon, Apphia, Archippus, and those mentioned in ver. 2. The same expectation of recovering his liberty appears in Phil. i. 25 , ii. 24 ; there, however, the journey contemplated is to the Philippians, and the date when it is formed, according to the general view, a year or two later; comp. Wieseler, Chronol. p. 456.
23. $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \pi \dot{\alpha} \zeta \epsilon \tau \alpha \iota]$ Greetings from the same persons as those mentioned in the Ep. to the Coloss. (ch. iv. 10 sq.), with the exception of Justus. The order observed is substantially the same, Mark and Aristarchus (oi ờ $\partial \tau e s$ ह̇k $\pi \in \rho i \tau o \mu \eta ิ s$, Coloss. iv. 11) preceding Luke and Demas, except that Epaphras is here placed first. The reading à $\sigma \pi d{ }_{S}$ Sourau $^{[R e c .}$ with $\mathrm{D}^{2} \mathrm{D}^{3} \mathrm{KL}$ ] is rightly rejected by most modern editors as a grammatical correction. $\quad \delta \sigma v \nu a \iota \chi \mu \alpha ́ \lambda, \mu \circ v]$ 'my fellow-prisoncr;' more specifically defined as èे $\mathrm{X} \rho / \sigma \tau \bar{\varphi}$ ' $\mathrm{I} \eta \sigma o v ̀$; sec on Eph. iv. 1. The title here given to Epaphras is, in Col. iv. 10, given to 'ApícтapXos, while the latter is afterwards named as a $\sigma v y e \rho \gamma{ }^{\prime}$ : for the probable reasons, see notes on Col. l. c.
24. Md́pkos] Probably John Mark, and the Evangelist. For a brief notice of him, and those mentioned in this verse, see notes on Col. iv. 10 and 14.
25. $\dot{\eta} \chi$ d́pıs к. т. 入.] Precisely the same form of salutation as in Gal. vi. 18, with the excoption of the significant conclusion $\dot{\alpha} \delta \bar{\delta} \lambda \phi 0$. As there, so here (comparo also 2 Timothy iv. 22), the apostle prays that the grace of the Lord may be
 those whom he is addressing, with the third and highest portion of our composite nature ; see notes on Gal. l. c., Destiny of Creature, p. 113 sq., and compare Olshaus. Opusc. vx. p. 145 sq.

## TRANSLATION.

## NOTICE.

Tue following translation is based on the same principles as those adopted in the portions of this Commentary that have already appeared. The increased and increasing interest in the sulject of revision has, however, induced me to be a little fuller in the citations from the eight Versions, which are here compared with the Authorized, and has also suggested the insertion of a few comments on general principles of translation, and of a few brief reasons for changes, which the notes on the original might not fully supply. My humble endeavor has been to avoid everything that might seem arbitrary and capricjous, and to cling with all possible tenacity to fixed principles of correction; still there both are and must be many passages in which the context and general tone of the original render one of two apparently synonymous translations not only more appropriate, but even more faithful and correct, than the other. In the present edition a few alterations have been made, but not any of sufficient importance to recquire here to be separately specified.

Of the older English Vv., the attention of the student may be especially directed to the version of Coverdale, which, considering the time and circumstances under which it was executed, appears remarkably vigorous and faithful. This venerable Version has now become accessible by the reprint of Coverdale's Bible, published by Messrs. Bagster ; but a small and cheap edition of the New Testament alone, with perhaps the Version in the 'Duglott' cdition [Cov. (Test.)], would, I am confident, be very acceptable to many students who may be deterred by the size and price of the reprint above alluded to. Some interesting remarks on these Versions, and on the subject of Revision generally, will be found in a tract by 'Plilalethes,' entitled The English Bible, 8vo. Dublin, 1857.

# THE EPISTLE T0 TIIE PHILIPPIANS. 

## CHAPTERI.

PAUL and Timothy, servants of Christ Jesus, to all the saints in Christ Jesus which are at Philippi, with the bishops and deacons: ${ }^{2}$ grace be unto you, and peace, from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ.
${ }^{3}$ I thank my God upon all my remembrance of you, ${ }^{4}$ always, in every supplication of mine for you all, making my supplication with joy, ${ }^{5}$ for your fellowship shown toward the Gospel from the first day until now; ${ }^{6}$ being confident of this very thing, that He

Chapter I. 1. Servants] So Wid.: 'the servants,' Auth. and the other $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$. On the designation Timothy ('Timotheus,' Auth.), see notes on Coloss. i. 1 (Transl.).
'*Jesus Christ,' Auth.
2. And the Lord] So Cov. (Test.) : ‘and from the Lord,' Auth. and the other $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$. except Wicl., 'of.' It is perhaps more exact to omit the preposition in the second member, as in the Greek : here it is unimportant, but in some cases the sense and construction are impaired by the repetition ; comp. Blunt, Lect. on Par. Priest, pp. 55, 56.
3. All my remembrance] 'Every remembrance,' Auth.
4. Supplication] 'Prayer,' Auth. and all Vv .: it is perhaps better to retain
the more special meaning, as evincing the carnest nature of the apostle's prayer; comp. notes on 1 Tim. ii. 1, and notice below, Wicl., Cov. (Test.), in the translation of the second $\delta$ dé $\eta \sigma$ ts. It is curious that all the $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$. except Auth: change to the plural, 'all my prayers;' this certainiy preserves the $\pi \alpha \rho \eta \chi \eta \sigma \iota s$ (compare on Eph. v. 20), but at the expense of accuracy. My supplication] 'Request,' Auth.; 'bisechynge,' Wicl.; 'instaunte prayer,' Cov. (Test.); 'praier,' Bish.; 'petition,' Rhem.; the remaining $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$. adopt the simple verb 'and praye' (Tynd., Cov., Cran.), or 'praying, ( Gen.).
5. Shown toward] ' 'In,' Auth. and all Vv. except Cran., 'of.'
6. Began] 'Hath begun,' Auth. In you a good work] So Wicl., Cov. (Test.),
which began in you a good work, will perfect it up to the day of Christ Jesus : ${ }^{7}$ even as it is meet for me to think this of you all, because I have you in my heart ; inasmuch as both in my bonds, and in my defence and confirmation of the gospel, ye all are partakers with me of my grace. ${ }^{8}$ For God is my witness, how I do long after you all in the bowels of Christ Jesus. ${ }^{9}$ And this I pray, that your love may yet more and more abound in knowledge and in all discernment, ${ }^{10}$ to the intent that ye may prove things that are excellent, that ye may be pure and without offence against the day of Christ ; ${ }^{11}$ being filled with the fruit of righteousness, which is by Jesus Christ, unto the glory and praise of God.

Rhem.: ' a good work ('that g. w.,' Cov., ' the,' Coverd. Test.) in you,' Auth. and the other $V_{V}$.

Perfect 1 So
Rhem., and sim. Cov. (Test.), 'fulende:' 'perform,' Auth., Wicl., Cranm., Bish.; 'go forthe with it,' Tynd., Cov., Gen.
Up to] Sim. Rhem. 'unto:' 'until,' 4uth. and remaining $V_{v}$. except Wicl., 'til in to.'

Christ Jesus]
'*Jesus Christ,' Auth.
7. My defence] So Cov. (Test.), Gen.: 'the,' Auth., Cranm., Bish., Rhem.; 'in defendynge,' Wicl., Cou. ; 'as I defende,' Tynd.

Partakers with me]
So Cov. and sim. Tynd., Cranm.," companions of grace with me;' 'partakers of my grace,' Auth., Genev, Bish., and sim. Wicl., 'felowis of my joic ;' 'partakers of my joye,' Cov. (Test.), Rhem.
8. Witness] So Wicl., Rhem:: 'record,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Tynd., Gen., 'beareth me recorde.'
Do long] So Cov. ('Test.), and sim. Cov.; 'greatly long,' Auth. and other Vv. except Wicl., Rhem., 'coueite;' Bish, 'hartely I long.' The insertion of the auxiliary seems to throw a slight emphasis on the action expressed by the verb, which is not inappropriate after the solemn'adjuration. Christ Jesus]
‘*Jesus Christ,' Auth.
9. Yet more and more abound] Sim. Rhem., 'may more and more abound:'.
'abound yet more and more,'Auth., Bish., and, with similar position of the adverbs, the other $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{r}}$. The inversion seems a little more closely to preserve the Greek order and the connection of $\pi \epsilon p / \sigma \sigma \in \dot{v} \epsilon I \nu$ with the particulars in which the increase takes place.

All discernment] More literally 'all manner of,' etc., a translation actually adopted by Coverd., but marred by the untenable attraction, 'in all manner of knowledge and in all experience.'

Discernment] 'Judgment,' Auth., Gen.; 'wit,' Wict.; 'fealinge,' Tynd.; 'experience,' Cov.; 'understandyng,' Cov. (Test.), Cranm., Bish., Rhem.
10. To the intent that] 'That,' Auth. and all other $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$. It seems desirable to make some difference in translation between the more immediate eis $\tau \delta \kappa$. $\tau, \lambda$. and the further and final /va गे $\tau \in \kappa, \tau \cdot \lambda$. Prove] So Wicl., Cov. : ‘approve,' Auth., Rhiem.; 'accepte,' Tyndale, Cranmer; 'alowe,' Cov. ('Test.); 'diserne,' Gen., Bish. Pure] So Tynd. and all Vv. except Auth., Rhem., 'sincere;' Wicl., 'clene.' Against] So' Coverd. (Test.) : 'till,' Auth., Bish., and sim. Tynd., Cran., Gen., 'untyll;' 'in,' Wicl.; 'unto,' Cov., Rhem.
11. Fruitt] '*Fruits, Auth.

Is] 'are,' Auth.
12.' Now] 'But,' Auth., Cov. (Test.);
${ }^{12}$ Now I would have you know, brethien, that matters with me have fallen out rather unto the furtherance of the gospel ; ${ }^{13}$ so that my bonds have become manifest in Christ in the whole protorium, and to all the rest ; ${ }^{14}$ and that the greater part of the brethren having in the Lord confidence in my bonds, are more abundantly bold to speak the word without fear. ${ }^{15}$ Some indeed preach Christ even from envy and strife; and some too from good will : ${ }^{16}$ they that are of love so preach, because they know that I am set for the defence of the gospel ; ${ }^{17}$ but they that are of contentiousness pro-

Bish.; 'for,' Wicl.; 'and,' Rhem.; the rest omit.

Have you know] So Rhem., and sim. Cov. (Test.), 'have you to wite :' ' wole that ye wite,' Wicl.; 'ye should understand,' Auth., Cranm., Bish., and sim. Tynd., Coverd., Genev., 'wolde ye understode.' Matlers with me]. Somewhat similarly, Wicl., Cov. (Test.), 'the thingis that ben aboute me:' 'the things about me,' Rhem.; 'the things which happened unto me,' Author., Cranmer, Genev. ('have hap.') Bish. ('came'); 'my busynes,' Tynd., Cov.
13. Have become] Sim. Wicl., Coverd. (Test.), Rhem., 'weren made:' 'are,' Auth. and remaining V v .
The perfect is adopted as perhaps better continuing the tease of the preceding member.

Manifest in Christ]
' Bonds in Clrist,' Auth.
The
whole Pretorium] ' All the palace,' Auth.; 'eche moot halie,' Wicl.; 'all the judyment hall,' Tynd., Coverd., Cran., Gen., Bish. ; 'every judgment house,' Coverd. ('Test.) ; 'al the court,' Rhem.
To all the rest] Sim. Rhem., ' in all the rest:' Auth. (Marg.), 'to all others ;' 'in all other places,' Auth. and remaining $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$.
14. That the greater part] 'Many,' Auth. and the other V v . except Wicl., ' mo.' All however except Auth, prefix 'that.' Baving in the Lord, etc.] 'Brethren in the Lord, waxing confident by my bonds,' Auth., and, with
some variations, the other $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$. except Wicl., Coverd. (Test.), which connect iv Kvpí $\omega$ with $\pi \epsilon \pi o \imath \sigma$ Tas.
15. From] 'Of,' Auth., Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen., Bish.; ' for,' Wicl., Coverd. (Test.), Rhem. Too] 'Also,' Auth., Gen., Rhem.; the rest omit.
From] 'Of,' Auth. and the other $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$. except Wicl., Cov. (Test.), Rhem., 'for.'
16. They that are, etc.] 'But the other of love,' Auth., but with a transposition of ver. 15 and $16 . \quad$ Because they know] So Cran., and sim. Tynd., Cov., 'because they se :' 'knowing,' Auth., Cov. (Test.), Gen., Bish., Rhem.; ' witynge, Wicl.
17. But they that are, etc.] 'The one preach Christ of contention, not sincerely, supposing to add affliction to my bonds,' Auth., but with a transposition of ver. 15 and 16. There is some little difficulty in finding a suitable translation for 'ephetía. On the one hand, the older translation, 'strife,' Wicl., Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen., Bish., is certainly open to the objection of confounding ${ }^{\text {ep }}$ ps and tpiveia, from which that of Auth., Cov. (Test.), Rhem., viz., 'contention,' is scarcely free: on the other hand, the more lexically exact, 'a spirit of intrigue,' here certainly presents an inadequate antithesis to à $\gamma \mathbf{a} \pi \eta$. In this difficulty perhaps the term chosen in the text sufficiently maintains the antithesis, while in its etymological formation it approaches lexical accuracy by keeping
claim Christ, not sincerely, thinking thus to raise up afliction unto my bonds. ${ }^{18}$ What then! notwithstanding, in every way, whether in pretence or in truth, Christ is proclaimed, and therein I do rejoice ; yca, and I shall rejoice; ${ }^{19}$ for I know that this shall issue to me unto salvation, through your supplication and the supply of the Spirit of Jesus Christ, 20 according to my steadfast expectation and hope, that in nothing I shall be put to shame, but that with all boldness, as always, so now also, Christ shall be magnified in my body, whether it be by life, or by death. ${ }^{21}$ For To ME to live is Christ, and to die is gain. ${ }^{22}$ But if to live in the flesh, - if THIS is to me the fruit of my labor, then what I should choose I wot not. ${ }^{23}$ Yea I am held in a strait betwixt the troo, having the desire to
in view the spirit, the spirit of faction and dissension, that actuated the opponents.

Proclain] 'Preach,'
Auth. and the other Vv. except Wicl., Cov. (Test.), 'schewen.'
Thinking] 'Supposing,' Auth.
To raise up] ' *To add,' Auth.
18. In every way] 'Every way,' Auth.; 'on alle maner,' Wicl.; 'all maner wayes,' Tynd., Cov. (' of wayes '), Gen.; 'by every meane,' Cov. (Test.); 'anye maner of waye,' Cran., Bish.; 'by al meanes,' Rhem.

Proclaimed] 'Preached,' Auth. and other Vr. except Wicl., 'schewid.'

Therein I]
'I therein,' Auth.: changed to avoid any false emphasis on the pronoun.
Shall] So Wicl. and Coverd. (Test.) : 'will,' Auth. and the remaining Vv.
19. Issue to me unto salv.] Sim. Rhem., 'shall fall out to me unto salv. :' ' 'turn to my salv.,' Auth., Gen., Bish.; 'come to me in to helthe,' Wicl. ; 'shall befal unto me to saluacion,' Coverd. (Test.) ; 'shall chaunce to my salv.,' Tynd., Cov., Cran.

Supplication] 'Prayer,' Auth. and all the other Vv .
20. Steadfast expectation] 'Earnest expectation,' Auth., Bish.; 'expectacion,' Cranm., Rhem.; 'abidynge,' Wicl.; ' as I hertely doke for,' Tynd., Cov.; Gen.; 'waytynge for,' Cov. (Test.).

Hope] So Wicl., Cov. (Test.), Cranmi, Rhem.: ' my hope,' Auth.; ' and hope' (verb), Tynd., Cov., Gen., Bish.
Put to shame] 'Ashamed,' $\Delta u$ uth. and all $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$. except Rhem., 'confounded:' it seems desirable to preserve and express the passive aioxvish hooual.
22. But if to live, etc.] ' But if I live in the flesh, this is the fruit of my labor,' Auth., and somewhat similarly as to construction, Tynd., Cran.: the other Vr. are perplexed, except $C_{o v .,}$ ' but in as moch as to live in the flesh is fruteful to me for the worke,' and better Coverd. (Test.), 'yf to live here in the flesh is frute of my labour, what,' etc., in which though the rovioo is overlooked, that division between protasis and apodosis is the preserved which seems, on the whole, most probable : so in this respect similarly Wicl., Rhem.

Then what] 'Yet what,' Auth.; '10 what,' Wicl.; 'and what,' Tynd., Cranm., Gen., Bish.; 'I wote not what,' Cov.; 'what,' Cov. (Test.). Should] 'Shall,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Tynd., Gen., 'to chose,' - an idiomatic translation, but tending to obscure the deliberative future. Wot not] So Auth., Tynd., Cov., Cranm., Gen., Bish.: scarcely exact, yet forcible and firm in cadence. The translation of Cov. (Test.),
depart, and to be with Christ, for it is very far better: ${ }^{24}$ yet to abide in the flesh is more needful for your sakes. ${ }^{25}$ And being persuaded of this, I know that I shall abide and shall continue here with you all for your furtherance in and joy of Faith, ${ }^{26}$ in order that your ground of boasting may abound in Christ Jesus in me through my presence with you again.
${ }^{27}$ Only let your conversation be worthy of the gospel of Christ;
'I cannot tel,' is idiomatic, and preferable to 'knowe not,' Wicl., Rhem.
23. Yea] '*For,' Auth.

I am held in a strait] 'I am in a strait,'. Auth., Bish.; ‘I am constreyved,' Wicl., Tynd., Cran.; 'both these thinges lye harde upon me,' Cov.; 'I am in distresse with two things,' Cov . (Test.) ; 'I am greatly in doubte,' Genev. 'I am straitened,' Rhem. The two] 'Two,' Auth. and the other Vv . except Cov. and Rhem., which (the former somewhat too strongly) express the article.

The desire] 'A desire,' Auth., Cov. (Test.), Bish. ; 'desire,' Rhem.; 'I have desire, Wicl.; 'I desyre,' Tynd., Cov., Cranm.; (desiring,' Gen. For it is, etc.] 'Which is far better,' Author.; 'it is myche more better,' Wiclif; 'which thinge is best of all,' Tynd., Genev. ; 'which thinge were moch more better,' Cov.; ' the whyche is much more better,' Cov. (Test.) ; 'and to be with Christ is moch better,' Cran.; 'which is muche farre better,' Bish.; 'a thing much more inetter,' Rhem.
24. Yet] 'Nevertheless,' Auth., Tynd., Cran., Gen., Bish. ; 'but,' Wicl. and the remaining Vv .

For your sutkes] So Cov. (Test.) : 'for you,' Auth. and the other $\nabla_{\mathrm{V}}$.
25. Being persuaded of this] 'Having this confidence,' Author.; 'trustynge,' Wich., Cov. (Test.), Rhem.; ' am I sure of,' Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gien., Bish.
Shall continue here with] 'Continue with,' Author., with a difference: of reading, whieh, however, does not affect the translation. The Vv. are nearly all
identical with Author., except Wich, 'dwelle and perfightli dwelle,' and Cov. (Test.), 'continue with you all unto the end.' Furtherance in] 'Your furtherance and joy,' Author., Cranmer ('youre faith'), Bish., Rhemish ('the faith ') ; ' youre profight and joie of faith,' Wich. ; 'the furth. and joye of youre f.,' Tynd., Cov. ; 'to youre profite and rejeycynge of f.,' Cov. (Test.) ; 'the furtherance and joy of your f.,' Gen.
26. In order that] 'That,' Auth. and all $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$. Ground of boasting] 'Rejoicing,' Auth., Cov. (Test.), Cran., Bish.; 'thanke,' Wicl.; 'may moare abundantly rejoyce,' 'Tynd., Cov. (om. 'moare'), Genev.; 'your gratulation,' Rhem. Abound] So Wicl., Rhem., and sim. Cov. ('Test.), 'be plenteous:' 'be more abundant,' Author., Cran. (' the more'). For Tynd., Cov., Gen., Bish., see above.
In me] So IFicl., Cranm. (but 'thorowe J. C.'), Rhem.: ' for me,' Auth., Gen., Bişh.; 'thoorowe me,' Tynd., Cov.; ' byे me,' Cov. (Test.).

Through my presence with youl] 'By my coming to yon,' Auth. and most of the other $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{V}}$., -but perhaps less exact than in the text.
27. Worthy of] So Coverd. (Test.), Rhem., and sim. Wicl., 'worthili to': ' as it becometh,' Author. and remaining $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$. Remain absent] 'Be absent,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Wicl., 'ethir absent;' Cov. (Test.), 'beynge absent.' Are standing] Sim. Wicl., Rhem., 'ye stonden :'. 'stand fast,' Author., and sim. Coverd. (Test.);
that whether I come and see you, or remain absent, I may hear of your affairs, that ye are standing in one spirit, with one soul striving together for the faith of the gospel, ${ }^{28}$ and not being terrified in anytling by your adversaries; the which is to them an evidence of perdition, but to you of salvation, and this from God: ${ }^{29}$ because unto you was granted, in behalf of Christ, not only to believe in Him, but also in behalf of Him - to suffer ; ${ }^{30}$ having the same conflict as ye saw in me, and now hear of in me.

## CHAPTER II.

If then there be any exhortation in Christ, if any comfort of love, if any fellowship of the Spirit, if any bowels and compassions, ${ }^{2}$ make
'stande stedfaste;' 'contynue,' Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen., Bish.
Soul] So Tynd., Coverd., Cranm., Bish. : ' minde,' Auth., Gen., Rhem., and sim. Cov. ('Test.), 'one mynded;' 'wille,' Wicl.
28. Not being terrified] 'In nothing terrified,' Auth.; 'in no thing be ye aferd,' Wicl., Cov. (Test.), 'afraid;' 'in nothynge fearinge,' Tynd., Cov., Cran., Bish.; 'in nothing feare,' Gen.; 'in nothing be ye terrified,' Rhem.
The which] So Cov. (Test.): 'which,' Auth. and all remaining Vv .
Evidence] 'Evident token,' Author.; ‘cause,' Wicl., Coverd. (Test.), Cranm., Rhem. ; 'token,' Tynd., Coverd., Genev., Bish. This from] Sim. Rhem., 'this of:' 'that of,' Auth. and remaining Vv. except Wicl., ' this thing is of.'
29. Because] 'For,' Auth. and all Vv. Was granted] 'It is given,' Auth. and all $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{V}}$. In Him] So Wicl., Cov. (Test.), Rhem.: ' on Him,' Author. and remaining $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$. It seems very desirable, on account of the etymological affinity of $\epsilon$ is ( $\dot{\epsilon} \nu s$ ) and $\epsilon \nu \nu$ (Donalds. Cratyl. § 170), to translate $\pi \iota \sigma \tau \in \dot{v} \in \iota \nu$ eis, ' believe in' (where a more literal trans:lation is not possible), and to reserve ' on' for $\pi เ \sigma \tau \in \cup ́ \in L \nu$ èní: for the construc-
tion of this verb in the N. T., see notes on 1 Tim. i. 16, Reuss, Theol. Chret. Iv. 14, Vol. 1. p. 129, and Rev. Transl. of St. John, p. x.

In behalf of Him, etc.] 'Suffer for His sake,' Author. and the other Vr. except Wicl., Coverd. (Test.), Rhem., 'for Him.' For the reasons for this change, see notes.
30. As ye saw] So Cov. (Test.), Rhem. (' have seen '), and sim. Cran., 'soch a fyght as ye saw :' 'which ye saw,' Auth. and remaining Vv. (Cov., 'have sene'). Hear of] 'Hear to be,' Author., Genev. ('have heard'); 'han herde of me,' Wicl., Rhem.; ' hear of me,' Tynd., Cov. (both), Cran.; 'heare in me,' Bish.

Chapter II. 1. If then there be] 'If there be therefore,' Auth., Cov. (Test.), Cran., Gen., Bish.; 'therfor if ony comfort is,' Wicl. ; 'if therefore there be,' Rhem. ; Tynd. and Cov. omit oûv.
Exhortation] 'Consolation,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Wicl., Cov., 'comfort.' Compassions] 'Mercies,' Auth. and sim. Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen., Bish., 'mercy;' 'inwardnesse of merci doynge,' Wicl.; 'entier mocion of pytie,' Coverd. (Test.) ; 'bowels of commiseration," Rhem.
2. Make ye full] 'Fulfil ye,' Auth.
ye full my joy, that ye mind the same thing, having the same love, with united souls minding the one thing; ${ }^{3}$ minding nothing in the way of contentiousness, nor in the way of vain glory, but with due lowliness of mind esteeming other superior to themselves; ${ }^{4}$ not looking each of you to your own things, but each of you to the things of others also. ${ }^{5}$ Verily have this mind within you, which was also in Christ Jesus: ${ }^{6}$ who, though existing in the form of God, estecmed not His being on an equality with God a prize to be seized on, ${ }^{7}$ but emptied Himself, taking upon Him the form of

Mind the same thing] Sim. Wicl., 'understonde the same thing:' 'be like minded,' Auth., Cranm., Genev., Bish.; 'drawe one way,' Tynd., Cov. ; ' mynde one thing,' Coverd. (Test.) ; 'be of one meaning,' Rhem.

With united souls, etc.] 'Being of one accord, of one mind,' Author., and sim. Tynd., Cov., Cranm. ('and of'), Bish.; 'of o wille and felen the same thing,' Wicl.; ' of one mynde meanynge one thynge,' Cov. (Test.); ' of oue accorde and of one judgment,' Cran.; 'of one mind, agreeing in one,' Rhem.
3. Minding, etc.] 'Let nothing be done through,' Auth., Cov. (Test.), Bish., and sim. Tynd., Cov. ('there be'), Cranm., Genev.; 'that nothinge be done;' 'no thing bi,' Wicl,, Rhem.
Contentioushess] Sim. Rhem., 'contention:' 'strife,' Auth. and the remaining $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{r} .}$; see notes on ch. i. 17 (Transl.).
Nor in the way of] '* Or ,' Aulh.
With due lowliness] 'In lowliness,' Auth.; 'in meknesse,' Wicl., Bish ; 'in mekeness of mind,' Tynd., Cranm., Genev.; 'thorow mekeness,' Cov. ; 'in humblenesse,' Coverd. (Test.); ' 'in humilitie,' Rhem. As the article does not appear merely used to give $\tau a \pi \epsilon \tau \nu$, its more abstract foree, but to mark the 'due, befitting ' lowliness by which the Philippians were to be influenced, the insertion would seem justifiable.

Esteeming]
So Coverd. (Test.); 'let each esteem,' Auth, and sim. the remaining $V$ r. ex-
cept IVicl. ('demynge'), Rhem. ('count. ing '), which retain the participial construction.

Superior to] Sim.
Cov. (Test.), 'the superiores of:' ' better than,' Author. and the other Vr. except Wicl., 'higher than.'
4. Not looking, etc.] '*Look not *every man on,' Author., and sim. in the imperative, Crannı., Genev., Bish.; 'not beholdynge,' Wicl.; 'and that no man consider,' Tynd. ; 'and let cuery man loke not for his awne profet,' Coverd.; 'euery ono consydering not,' Coverdale ('Test.), Rhem.

But each of: you, ctc.] 'But *every man also on,' Auth., and sim. Gen., Bishr, the only two Vv. that notice in translation the ascensive rai.
5. Verily] Auth. and all the VV. omit the translation of $\gamma$ d́p, except Wicl., 'and;' Rhem., 'for.' Hare this, etc.] '*Let this mind be in you,' Auth., sim. Tynd., Corv, Cran., Gen.; 'let the same mind, etc.,' Cov. (Test.), Bish.; 'that mind, etc.;' 'fele ye this thing in you,' Wicl.; ' this think in yourselves,' Rhem.
6. Though existing] 'Being,' Author., Tynd., Gen., Bish.; ' whanne Ho was,' Wicl. and remaining $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$.
Esteemed not, etc.] 'Thought it not robbery to be equal with God,' Auth., Tynd.; Cov., Bish., and sim. Cov. (Test.), Cran.; Gen., Rhem., 'no robbery, etc. ; ' demed not raueyn, that him silf were euene to God,' Wicl.
a servant, being made in the likeness of men : ${ }^{8}$ and being found in fashion as a man, He humbled Himself, becoming obedient even unto death, yea unto death on the cross. ${ }^{9}$ Wherefore God did also highly exalt Him, and bestowed on Him a name which is above every name, ${ }^{10}$ that in the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things on earth, and things under the earth; ${ }^{11}$ and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.
${ }^{12}$ So then, my beloved, even as ye were always obedient, not as in my prescuce only, but now much more in my absence, work out your own salration with fear and trembling. ${ }^{13}$ For it is God which worketh in you, both to will and to perform, of His good pleasure.
7. Emptied Hinsele] 'Made Himself of no reputation,' Author. and the other Vv. except Wicl., 'lowede Himself ;' Mhem., 'exinanited Him self.'
Tulving] So Wicl., Cov. (Test.), Cran., Bish., Rhem. : ' and took,' Auth. and the remaining Vv . There is some little difficulty in the translation of the modal (aor.) participle, when, as in the present case, the action of the participle is synchronous with that of the finite verb. On the whole, the pres. part. in English scems the best and most idiomatic equiralent, especially as in practice the tense of the finite verb seems so far reflected on the participle, that though really present in form, it becomes almost aoristic in sense. Being made] Sim. Bish., 'and made:' 'was made,' Auth., Wicl., Coo. (Test.), Gen. ; ‘became lyke,' Tynd., Coverd., Crann.; ' made into,' Rhem.
8. Becoming] 'And became,' Author. and the other $\mathrm{Vv}_{\mathrm{v}}$. except Wicl., 'and was made;' Cov. (Test.), 'was made ;' Bish., Rhiem., ' made.'
Even unto] 'unto,' Auth.
Yea unto deathl] Sim. Wicl., 'ye to the death :' ' even the death,'. Auth. and the other Vv. except Cov., which inserts 'uluto,' as in text. On the cross] 'Of the cross,' Auth. and all the other $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v} . \text { : }}$ the slight change seems to add somewhat to
perspicuity, and is compatible with the present use of the gen., which is one of 'more remote relation.'
9. Did also, etc.] So Conerd. (Test.), 'God also hath,' Auth., Cranm., Bish., Rhem. ; 'God enlauncid,' Wicl.; 'God hath exalted,' Tynd.; ' hath God, etc.,' Cov. ; 'God hath highly exalted,' Gen. The change in the text scems to have the advantage of placing the contrasting ral in more distinct connection with úrepú乡 $\omega \sigma \epsilon \mathrm{l}$. Bestowed on] Sịm. Wicl., Coverd. (Test.), 'gave:' 'given,' Author. and the remaining Vv. except Rhem., 'hath given.'
10. In the name] So Wicl., Tynd., Cov. (both), Cran., Gen., Bish.; ' at the name,' Auth., Gen. On earth] Sim. Coverd., ' upon erth :' 'in earth,' Auth. and remaining Vv. except Wicl., 'erthely thingis ;' Rhem., 'terrestrials.'
12. So then] 'Wherefore,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Wicl., Cov. (Test.), Rhem., 'thereforo.' Even as] ' as ,' Auth. Were always ob.] 'Have always obeycd,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Wiel., 'evermore ye han obeischid.'
13. To perform] So Wicl., Coverdale (Test.), and sim. Rhem., 'accomplish:' 'to do,' Auth., Bish.; ' the dede,' Tynd., Cqu., Cran., Gen.
${ }^{14}$ Do all things without murmurings and doubtings ; ${ }^{15}$ that ye may be blameless and pure, children of God without reproach, amidst a crooked and perverse generation, among whom ye appear as heavenly lights in the world, ${ }^{10}$ holding forth the word of life ; that I may have whereof to boast against the day of Christ, that I did not run in vain nor yet labored in vain. ${ }^{17}$ Howbeit if I be even poured out in the sacrifice and service of jour faith, I joy, and rejoice with you all. ${ }^{18}$ And for the same cause do ye also joy, and rejoice with me.
14. Doublings] So Wicl., Cov. (Test.), and sim. Rhem., 'staggerings:' 'disputings,' Auth. and, in the sing., Tynd., Cov., Cian., Bish.; 'reasonings,' Gen.
15. Pure] So Tynd., Cov., Gen., Bish.: ' harmless,' Author. (Marg. 'sincere'); 'simple,' Wicl., Coverd. (Test ), Rilhem.; 'unfayned,' Cran.

Children
of] So Coov. (Test.), Rheen.: 'the sons of,' Author. and remaining Vv. except C'run., 'unfayned sonnes of.'
Without reprouch] 'Without rebuke,' Auth. Amidst] '粗In the midst,' Auth. Generation] So Cov. (Test.), Rhem.: ' nation,' Auth. and remaining $V_{V}$.

Appear]
'Shine,' Auth. and all the other Vv.
Heavenly lights] 'Lights,' Auth. and all the Vv. except Wicl., 'geuers of light.'
16. Have whereaf, etc.] 'Rcjoice,' Author., Cranm., Geen.; 'to my glorie,' Wicl., Rhem.; ' unto my rejoysynge,' Tynd., Cov. (both.), Bishı. ('to'). Ayainst] 'In,' Auth. and all Vv.
Did not run] 'Have not run,' Auth. and all the $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$. The change to the aoristic form seems in this case clearly proper and necessary : the form with the auxiliary is here chosen for the sake of preserving the rhythm of the Auth. Ver., which can rarely be neglected without some loss to the general cadence of the verse. Modern translators have paid far too little attention to this not unimportant element in a good version of the Scriptures.

Nor yet] 'Neither,'

Author. and all the Vv. except Rhem., 'nor;' Cov. (Test.) omits. The change is here made in accordance with the rule generally followed in this revision - to adopt the weaker translation ('nor,' or 'neither') of the disjunctive ouvठ'́, where the meanings of the words it disjoins are more similar and accordant, the stronger and more emphatic ('nor yet'), where they are less so ; see notes on 1 Tim. i. 4 (Transl.).
17. Howbeit] 'Yea and,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Wicl., 'but though;' Cov. (Test.) 'but athough ;' Rhem., ' but and if,'-an archaic, but not otherwise unsatisfactory transl. Be even poured out] 'Be offered,' Auth, and sim. Tynd. (adds 'or slayn'), Cov., Cran., Gen., Bish., 'be offered up;' 'am off. up,' Cov. (Test.) ; 'be immolated,' Rhem.
In the] 'Upon the,' Autior. and all the $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$. (Wich., ' on the '); it seems, however, desirable to mark in translation that $\bar{\xi} \pi l$ has here probably not a local but an ethical reference; the more exact ' unto' (see notes) would here be hardly intelligible.
18. And for] 'For, etc.,' Auth. and the other $\mathrm{Vv}_{\mathrm{v}}$ except Wicl., 'and the same thing have ye joie;' Cov. (Tcst.), 'be ye glad also of the same ;' Rhem., 'and the self same thing do you also rejoice.' The regimen of autd is somewhat more exactly expressed by Coverd. (Test.) than by Auth. and the Text, but there seems scarcely sufficient reason to
${ }^{19}$ Tet I hope in the Lord Jesus short]; to send to you Timothy, that I also may be of good comfort, when I know your state. ${ }^{20}$ For I have no man likeminded, who will have a true care for your state. ${ }^{21}$ For they all seek their own things, not the things of Christ Jesus. ${ }^{2.2}$ But ye know the proof of him, that, as a child to a father, he served with me in furthering the gospel. ${ }^{23}$ Him, then, I hope to send forthrwith, so soon as I shall see how it will go with me.
introduce the change, especially as the sense would remain substantially the same, while the rhythm would certainly suffer.
Do ye also] Sim. Rhem., 'do you also:' 'also do ye,' Auth., Cran., Bish.; 'also, rejoice ye,' Tynd.; 'be ye glad also,' Cov. (both) ; 'also be ye glad,' G'en.: Wicl. omits 'also.'
19. Yet I hope] 'But I trust,' Author. (Marg., 'morcover'), Bish.; 'and I hope,' Wicl. Rhem.; 'I trust,' Tynd., Coi. (both), Cian., Gen. Shortly to, etc.] 'To send Timothy shortly unto you,' Author. and the other Vv. except Wicl., 'schal sende Tymothe soone to you;' Rhem., 'to send Tim, unto you quickly.' The change is made to endeavor to show that $\dot{v} \mu i v$ is the transmissive dative, and not the same as $\pi \rho \delta s$ úpâs, ver. 25 ; see notes.
20. Will have a true care] 'Will naturally care,' Auth., Bish.; 'is bisic for you with clene affection;' ' with so pure affeccion careth,' Tynd., Coverd., Gen.; 'be careful for you with sincere affeccion,' Cov. (Test.) ; 'with so pure aff. will care,' Cran. ; ' with sincere affection is carcful,' Rhem.
21. They all] So Coverd. (Test.), and somewhat sim. Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen. : 'all,' Author., Bish., Rhem. ; 'all men,' Wicl.

Own things ${ }^{\text {' } O w n, '}$ Author: and the other Vv. except Wicl., Rhem. 'the things that ben her orvne,' and sim. Cov. (Test.).

Of Christ Jesus] 'Which are *Jesus Christ's,' Auth., Crion., Cov. (Test.), ('that be'), Bish., Rheim. (' that are') ; 'that ben of

Crist Jhesus,' Wicl. ; ' that which is Jesus Christes,' Tynd., Cov., Gen The change in the text seems to leave the translation equally uncircumscribed with the Greek : the possessive gen. in English seems more limited.
22. The proof] So Auth. and all the Vv. except Wicl., 'assaie;' Rhemish, 'an experiment:' the meaning really amounts to 'proved character' (see notes), but as so many of the Vv . retain the literal meaning of $\delta$ oкц $\mu$, a change may be deemed unnecessary.
Child to a father] Sim. Cov. (both), 'a chylde unto the father:' 'a son with the father,' Auth., Bish., and the other Vv. except Wicl., 'a sone to the f. ;' Rliem., 'a sonne the father.' Served] Sim. Cov. (Test.), 'dyd he serve,' and sim. as to aoristic form, Tynd., Cranm., Gen. : 'hath served,' Auth., Wicl., Bish., IRhem.; 'hath he ministred,' Cov.
In furthering the gospel] 'In the gospel,' Author, and the other Vv. except Tynd., 'bestowed his labor upon the gospel.'
23. Then] 'Therefore,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Tynd., Coverd., which omit oũy in translation.
Forthwith] 'Presently,' Auth. ; 'immediately,' Rhem.: the rest omit. The concluding words of the verse are due to the version of Tynd., and have been retained by succeeding $V \mathrm{~V}$. except Bish., ' as soone as I knowe my estate;' Rhem., 'that concern me.' The sense is expressed with sufficient accuracy (seo notes) to render it undesirable to alter a translation so thoroughly idiomatic.
24. Byself also] So Coverd. (Test.),
${ }^{24}$ But I trust in the Lord that I myself also shall come shortly.
${ }^{25}$ Yet I supposed it necessary to send unto you Epaphroditus, my brother, and companion in labor, and fellow-soldier, but your messenger and minister to my need, ${ }^{26}$ since he was longing after you all, and was full of heaviness, becanse that ye heard that he had been sick. ${ }^{27}$ For indeed he was sick like unto death: howbeit God had mercy on him; and not on him only, but on me also, that I should not have sorrow upon sorrow. ${ }^{28}$ I have sent him

Rhem. (omits 'I'): 'also myself,' Auth. and the remaining $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$.
25. Unto you] So Coverd., and, after 'Epaphr.,' Tynd.. Cran., Gen.: 'to you,' Auth., Wicl., Bish., R2hem. ; Cov. (Test.) omits. It seems desir.ble to attempt to make a distinction between $\pi \rho \partial{ }^{\text {s }}$ úuâs and the transmissive dative ; see notes on ver. 19 .

Minister, etc.]
Sim. Wicl., Bish., 'the mynistre of my nede;' Rhem., ' minister of my necessitie ;' Tynd., Cov. [' nede'], 'my minister at my nedes:' 'he that ministered to 'my wants,' Auth.; 'the servant of my nede,' Cov. (Test.); ' which also mynysteretlı unto me at nede,' Cran.; 'he that ministered unto me such things as I wanted,' Gen.
26. Since] 'For,' Auth, and all the Vv. except Coverd., 'for so mochas,' an archaic, but not inexact translation; Rhem., 'because.'
He was lonying] 'He longed,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Wicl., 'he desired;' Rhem., 'he had a desire.' Ye
heard] So Wicl.: 'liad heard,' Author. and the remaining $V_{v}$. In the next member the English idiom scems clearly to require the pluperfect in translation; in the former member it may apparently be dispensed with.
27. Like unto] 'Nigh unto,' Author., Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen., Bish.; ' sike to the deeth,' Wicl. ; 'untyll death,' Cov. (Test.); 'even to death,' Rhem. Howbeit] ' But,' Auth. and all Vv.
That I should not] 'Lest I should have,'

Author. and the other Vv. except Wicl. 'leest I hadde;' Tynd., Cov., 'I shuld have had.'
28. Have sent] 'Sent,' Autho and all the other $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{r}}$. The change seems necessary, as $\stackrel{\pi}{\pi} \in \mu \psi \alpha$ is in all probability the epistolary norist' (see notes on Philemon 11), Epaphr. being apparently the bearer of this Epistle. It may be doubted whether the present ought not to he adopted, as in Coverd. (both): English idiom, however, seems in favor of the perfect ; compare notes on Coloss. iv. 8 (Transl.).

Therefore] So
Auth. and all the $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{V}}$; and apparently rightly, as this seems one of the cases in which oûv has a slighltly inferential force, which is inadequately expressed by 'then;' see notes on 1 Tim. ii. 1 .
Diligently] So Tynd., Bish., and sim. Cranm., Gen., 'diligentliar; ' ' compare 2 Tim. i. 17: ' carefully,'. Auth.; ' haistli,' Wicl., Coverd. ; 'spedely,' Cov. (Test.), Rhem. The translation of the text, though not wholly free from ainbiguity, perhaps shows a little more clearly than Author., al., that the apostle showed $\sigma$ тovṑ in sending Ep.
Itoo] Sim. Cov., 'I also:' 'I,' Auth. and remaining $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$. The inserted pronoun (' I on my side') perhaps suggests this slight addition.

Rejoice again] So Tynd., Cov., Cranm., Rhem., and sim. Wicl., Cov. (Test.): 'ayain, ye may rejoice,' Auth., Gen., Bish. Perhaps the insertion of the adverb between the auxiliary and the verb might seem
therefore the more diligently, that, when ye see him ye may rejoice again, and that I too may be the less sorrowful. ${ }^{29}$ Receive him then in the Lord with all joy, and hold such in honor ; ${ }^{30}$ because for the work of Christ he went nigh even unto death, having hazarded his life, to supply that which you lacked in your service to me.

## CHAPTER III.

Finally, my brethren, rejoice in the Lord. To write the same things to you, to me indeed is not irksome, while for you it is safe.
more consonant with the order of the Greck, and perhaps also with our present modes of expression: as, however, it has a tendency to suggest an undue emphasis on 'again,' and is, perhaps, a modern collocation, we retain the order of the older version. This is one of many minor points that would need careful consideration in any formal revision of our present version.
29. Then] 'Therefore,' Autl. and all $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$, see notes in loc. So Wicl., Rhem. ; 'gladness,' Auth. and the remaining $\mathrm{Vv}_{\mathrm{v}}$. It certainly seems undesirable to depart from the usual and almost semi-theological meaning of $\chi$ apa. In hoonor] So Coverd. (Test.), and sim. Wicl., Rhem.: 'in reputation,' Auth.; 'make moch of soche,' Tynd., Coverd., Cran., Gen., Bish.
30. Went nigh, etc.] ' Was nigh unto death,' Auth., Gien., Bish.; 'he wente to deeth,' Wicl.; 'he went so farre, that he was nye unto deeth,' Tynd., Cranm.; came nye unto,' Coverdale; 'went to even untyll death,' Coverdale (Test.); 'came to the point of death,' Rhem.
IIaving liazarded] ' Not regarding,' Auth., Bish.; 'geuynge his liif,' Wicl. ; 'and regarded not his lyfe,' Tynd., Coverd., Cran., Gen.; 'geuyng over his lyfe,' Coverd. (Test.); 'yelding his life,' Rhem. The translation of the aor. part., when
associated with the finite rerb, requires very careful consideration. Besides the usual periphrastic translations by means of temporal or causal particles, we have three forms of translation, $-(a)$ the present participle ; (b) the past participle, with the auxiliary 'having;' (c) the idiomatic conversion into the finite verb with 'and.' Of these, (a) is especially admissible when the part. defines more elosely the manner of the action expressed by the finite verb, or the circumstances under whicl' it took place (see notes on ch. ii. 7) ; (b) is often useful when it is necessary to mark the priority of the action of the part. to that of the finite verb; (c) sometimes serves to mark their contemporaneity. In the present case the ehoice seems to be between ( $b$ ) and (c), as the $\pi a \rho a \beta o \lambda$. may be regarded as partly accompanying, and partly as having preceded, the ク̈भरıбєv. As, logically considered, the latter idea scems here distinctly more prominent, we adopt the second form of translation.
That which, etc.] So somewhat similarly Tynd., Cor., G'en., 'that service which was lacking on your part to me :' ' your lack of service to me,' Auth., Bish.; 'that that falid of you anentis my service,' Wicl. - not an incorrect view of the gen. (see notes) ; 'it that was wantynge unto you toward my willynge ser-
${ }^{2}$ Look to the dogs, look to the evil-workers, look to the concision. ${ }^{3}$ For we are the crrcumcision, which by the Spirit of God do serve Him, and make our boast in Christ Jesus, and put no coufidence in the flesh; ${ }^{4}$ though myself possessed of confidence even in the flesh. If any other man deemeth that he can put confidence in the flesh, I more : ${ }^{5}$ circumcised the eighth day, of the stock of Israel,
vyce,' Cov. (Test.); 'that which was lackynge on youre part toward me,' Cran. ; ' that which on your part wanted toward my service,' Rhem.

Chapter III. 1. Irksome] 'Grievous,' Author. ; 'it is not slowe,' Wicl.; 'it greveth me not,' Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen., Bish.; 'no grefe,' Cov. (Test.); 'tedious,' Rhem. While] 'But,' Auth., Cov. (Test.) ; 'and,' Wicl., Cov., Gen., Rhem.; ' for to you it is, etc.' Tynd., Cran., Bish. It would at first sight seem desirable to suppress the $\mu \mathrm{e} \nu$ in translation ; as, howevor, the opposition $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu-\delta$ - is sparingly used in the N . T., and only when a somewhat decided. contrast is intended, it is best to retain Auth.
2. Look to (3 times)] Sim. Wicl., 'se ye;' Rhem., 'see:' 'beware of,' Author. and the remaining Vv .
The dogs] So Rhem.: 'dogs,' Auth. and the remaining Vv . The presence of the article with the two following substantives seems to show that here the article is not merely generic, but distinctive and definitive: 'indicat cum de certis quibusdam loqui, quos illi noverint,' Erasm. in loc. The evil] So Rhem. : Auth. and the remaining Vv . omit the article.
3. By the Spirit of, etc.] 'Worship *God in the spirit,' Author. It seems permissible to add 'Him' to the absolute $\lambda a \tau \rho \in$ éovées in accordance with Auth. in Luke ii. 37, Acts xxvi. 7. The translation of Cov., 'even we that serve, etc.,' by which the appositional character of oi $\Pi \nu \in v \dot{\mu} . \kappa_{,} \tau . \lambda_{0}$. is fully preserved, is not undeserving of notice: there seems, how-
ever, scarcely sufficient reason for a change.

Mulie our boast]
Sim. Wicl., Rhem., 'glorien :' 'rejoico,' Auth. and the remaining Vv.
Put] 'Ilave,' Auth. On account of the next clause it seems desirablo here to avoid the use of 'have.'
4. Myself possessed of] "Though I might also have,' Bish., Auth., and sim. Rhem. ('albeit I also have'); 'though I have trist,' Wicl.; 'though I also have confidence,' Coverd. (Test.) ; 'though I have wher of I msght rejoyce,' Tynd., Cov., (ien. ; 'though I myght also rejoyce,' Cran. The change to 'possessed of,' is an endeavor to mark the 'liabens, non utens' implied hero by $\epsilon^{\epsilon} \chi \omega \nu$, and to draw a distinction in translation between

Even in the] 'In the flesh,' Auth. and all the Vv. cxcept Wicl., 'in flesh.'
Deemeth] 'Thinketh,' Author, and the other $V \mathrm{v}$. except Wicl., 'is seyn to trist;' Cov. (Test.), 'semeth to have;' Rhem., 'seeme to have.' The slightly stronger 'deemeth,' appears best to coincide with the view of $\delta o k \in \hat{\imath}$ adopted in the notes.
Can put conf.] 'Hath whereof he might trust,' Auth., Tynd., Cran., Gen., Bish.; 'is seyn to trust,' JVicl.; 'whereof he might rejoyce,' Cov.; 'scemeth to have confidence,' Coverdale (Test.), Rhemish ('seeme'). The literal translation, 'that he hath confidence,' is here slightly ambiguous, and appy. warrants our adopting the slight periphrasis in the text.
5. As regards] 'As touching,' Auth.; 'bi,' Wicl.; 'as concernynge,' Tynd., Cov., Cran.; 'after,' Cov. (Test.), Bish.; 'by profession a Ph.,' Gen. ; ' according.
of the tribe of Benjamin, an Hebrew of the IIebrews; as regards the law, a Pharisec ; ${ }^{6}$ as regards zeal, persecuting the church; as regards the righteousness which is in the law, having lived blameless. 'Howbeit what things were gain to me, these for Christ's sake I have counted loss. ${ }^{8}$ Nay more, and I do also count them all to be loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord ; for whose sake I suffered the loss of all thinys, and do
to,' Rhem. It will be seen (from next verse) that Wicl. and Rhem. are the only two which preserve the same translation of $\kappa a \tau \alpha{ }_{\alpha}$ in the three clauses: this certainly seems desirable, as more clearly directing the reader's attention to the three theological characteristics of the apostle, which are not improbably climactic in arravgement.
6. As regards] 'Concerning,' Author., Bish.; 'as concernynge,' Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen.; ' after,' Cov. (Test.); 'according to,' Rhem. As regards the, etc.] 'Touching,' Author., Bish.; 'bi,' Wicl. ; ' as touchynge,' Tynd., Cov., Cranm., Gen.; 'according to,' Coverd. (Test.), Rhem.

Having lived blameless] Sim. Wicl., 'lyuynge without playnte:' $\operatorname{Cov}$. (Test.), 'I have walked wythout blame;' Rhem., 'conversing without blame;'' 'blameless,' Auth.; 'I was unrebukeable,' Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen.; 'I was blameless,' Bish. The addition of Wicl. serves to mark, though not quite adequately, the $\gamma$ evoduevos which Auth. leaves unnoticed.
7. Howbeit] 'But,' Auth. and all the $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{V}}$. The adversative $\grave{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha}$ seems here to require a stronger translation than the merely oppositive ' but.'
These] So Wicl.: 'those,' Auth., Cran., Bish., Rhem. ; 'the same,' Tynd., Cov. (both), Gen. For Christ's sake] So Tynd., Cov. (both), Cranm., Gen., Bish., but at the end of the sentence: 'for Christ,' Auth., Wicl., Rhem. -also at the end. The change of order perhaps keeps up the antithesis $\kappa$ époos
and Snula with a little moro emphasis. Have counted] So sim. Coverd. (Test.), 'have I counted;' Wicl., 'I have domede ;' Rhemish, ' have I esteemed ;' scounted,' Auth. and the remaining Vr.
8. Nay more] ' 'YYea doubtless,' Auth., Gen.; 'yetheless,' Wicl.; 'ye,' Tynd., Cov., Cran., Bish. ; ' neverthelesse,' Cov. (Test) ; 'yea but,' Rhem. The most literal translation would perhaps be ' nay indeed as was said,' but is obviously too heavy for, an idiomatic version; comp. notes.

Do also count them all] 'I count all things,' Auth., Cov. (Test.); 'I gesse alle thingis,' Wicl.; 'I thinke all thynges,' Tynd., Cov., Cranm., Gen., Bish.; 'I esteeme al things,' Rhem. The insertion of 'them,' and the change to 'do also count,' seem required to show that the real emphasis docs not rest on жd́via, but on $\dot{\eta} \gamma \mathbf{\gamma} \hat{\nu} \mu a l$ as contrasted with ク̈रクпuat, while $\pi \dot{d} \nu \tau a$ refers back to the preceding ätuva к. $\tau_{.} \lambda_{.}$; comp. Meyer in loc.

To be loss] So Cov. (Test.), and sim. Wicl., 'to be peirement:' ' but loss,' Author. and the remaining Vv. For whose sake] So Coverd. (Test.), Bish.: ' for whom,' Auth. and the remaining $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{V}}$. : change for the sake of accordance with the translation of $\delta i \grave{c} \tau \delta \nu \mathrm{X} \rho$., ver. 7.
Suffered]. 'Have suffered,' Auth., and similarly with the auxiliary 'have,' all Vr. except Wicl., 'I mado alle thingis poirement.' To be ding] So Bish: 'but dung,' Auth., Tynd., Cov.r Gen., Bish.; 'as drit,' Wicl.; 'ns dounge.' Cov. (Test.), Rhem.; ' but סylle,' Cran.
count them to be dung, that I may win Christ, ${ }^{9}$ and be found in Him, not having mine own righteousness, which is of the law, but that which is through Faith in Christ, even the righteousness which cometh of God by Faith : ${ }^{10}$ that I may know Him, and the power of His resurrection, and the fellowship in His sufferings, being fashioned to the likeness of His death, ${ }^{11}$ if by any means I may attain unto the resurrection from the dead.
${ }^{12}$ Not that I have already attained, or am already made perfect ; but I am pressing onward if that I may lay hold on that for which
9. Faith in] Sim. Tyidd., 'the fayth which is in Christ:' 'the faith of,' Auth. and the remaining Vv . Even] So Cranm., and sim. Wicl., 'that is :' Tynd., Ger., 'I meane ;' Cov., 'namely;'Auth. and Bish. omit, and Coverd. (Test.) and Rhem. alter the construction. The insertion, thus sanctioned by six of the $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$., seems to add slightly both to the perspicuity and emphasis.
Cometh of ] So Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen., Bish.: 'is of,' Auth, Wicl., Rhem. ; Cou. (Test.) alters the construction The concluding words, 'by faith,' Auth. ('in faith,' Wicl., Coverdule (both), Rhem.; 'thorowe faith,' Tynd., Cranm., Genev., Bish.), are scarcely an exact translation of $\bar{\epsilon} \pi l \tau \hat{\eta} \pi i \neq \tau \tau \epsilon \iota$ (sec notes), but are perhaps a sufficiently close approximation to it to be preferable to any periphrasis ('grounded on faith,' 'resting on faith),' which an adhesion to the literal meaning of the prep: would render necessary.
10. In His] 'Of His,' Author. and the remaining Vv. Fashioned to, etc.] Somewhat sim. Wicl., ' made liik to ; ' Cov. (Test.), 'lyke fashioned with :?' '*made conformable unto,' Auth. and the remaining Vv. except Rhem. The expression in the original ( $\sigma \nu \mu \mu o \rho-$ $\phi\left(\zeta_{\epsilon \sigma N a \iota}\right.$ Navá $\tau \omega$ ) though perfectly intelligible, is so far unusual as to require some slight periphrasis in English: The shorter translation, 'being conformed to,' is perhaps open to objection as involving a use of ' conform,' which,
though sanctioned by. Hooker, is now of rare occurrence. The transl. of Conyb., 'sharing the likeness of,' is objectionable as obliterating the passive.
11. May] So Covervl. (both), Rhem.: 'might,' Author. and the remaining Vv. except Wicl., 'if......I come.'
From the dead] So Cov. : '*of the dead,' Author, and the remaining Vv. except Wicl., Cov. (Test.), Rhem., which follow the reading in the text. These three Vv . all translate т $\boldsymbol{y} \nu$ (' that is fro,' Wicl., Cov. (Test.); 'which is from,' Rhem.) : the insertion of the article is certainly intended emphatically to specify, but appy. falls short of the very distinctive force conveyed by the parallel insertion of the relative in English.
12. Not that] So Wicl., Cov. (both), Cran., Rhem. : 'not as though,' Auth., Tynd., Gen., Bish. I have] So Wicl., Coverd. (both), Cran., Rhem.: 'I had,' Auth., Tynd., Gen., Bish. On the use of the auxiliary 'have' in the translation of the aor. with $ク$ そ$\delta \eta$, see notes on Eph. iii. 5 (Transl.); and on 1 Tim. i. 20 (Transl.). Or am already, etc.] Sim. Wicl., ' or now am perfect;' Cov., Cran., ' or that I am all ready p.;' Cov. (Test.), 'or that I be now p.;' Rhem., ‘or now am p.;' 'either wero already perfect,' Auth., Tynd., Gen., Bish. On the translation of the perfect, see notes on Col. i. 16 (Trunsl.). , Am pressing] 'Follow after,' Auth., Bish.; 'sue,' Wicl. ; 'folowe,' Tynd., Coverd.,
also I was laid hold on by Christ. ${ }^{13}$ Brethren, I count not ayself to have gotten hold: but one thing I do, forgetting the things that are behind, and stretching forth after the things that are before, ${ }^{14}$ I press on toward the mark for the prize of the heavenly calling of God in Christ Jesus. ${ }^{15}$ Let us then, as many as be perfect, be of this mind: and if in any thing ye are differently minded, even this will God reveal unto you. ${ }^{16}$ Nevertheless, whereto we have attained, - in the same direction walk ye onward.
${ }^{17}$ Brethren, be followers together of me, and mark them which

Cran., Gen., Bish.; 'follow upon,' Cov. (Test.) ; 'pursuc,' Rhem.
Lay hold on - was laid hold on] ' Apprehend - am apprehended of,' Author.; ' comprehende - am comprehendide of,' Wicl. and the remaining Vv .
Christ] '*Christ Jesus,' Auth.
13. Gotten hold] So Cov. (Test.), and sim. Tynd., Cov., Cranm., 'gotten it:' 'apprehended,' Auth. ; 'comprehendide,' Wicl., Rhem. ; 'atteyned to the mark,' Gen. ; 'attained,' Bish.
One thing] So Wicl., Tynd., Cov. (both), Gen., Rhem.: 'this one thing,' Author., Cran., Bish.

The things] So
Wicl., Coverd. (Test.), Rhem. : 'those things,' Author., Cranm., Bish.; 'that which,' Tynd., Cov., Gen.
That are (twice)] So Wicl., Cov. (Test., once), Rhem. : 'which,' Auth. and the remaining $V_{v}$. If the distinction alluded to on Ephes. i. 23 be correct, 'that' would seem here slightly more exact than 'which.'

Stretching forth after] Sim. Wicl., 'strecche forth my silf to ;' Tynd., Cov., 'stretche my silfe unto ;' Cov. (Test.), 'stretchynge myself to ; ' Rhem., 'stretching forth myself to:' 'reaching forth unto,' Auth.; ' endeuore myself unto,' Cran., Gen., Bish.
14. Press on] 'Press,' Auth., Tynd., Cov. (both), Cranm., Bish.; 'pursue,' Wicl., Rhem.; 'follow hard,' Gen., Bish: In this verse the simple English present is more suitable than the auxiliary with the part., as in ver. 12. There the ad-
verb $\check{\Pi} \delta \eta$ and the past tenses ${ }^{*} \lambda \alpha \beta o \nu$ and $\tau \in T \in \lambda \in i \omega \mu \alpha l$ suggested a contrast in point of time ; here the iterative force involved in the English present (Latham, Engl. Lang. §573) is more appropriate.
Heavenly] 'High,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Rhem., 'supernal.'
15. Then] 'Therefore,' Auth. and all the Vv. Of' this mind] 'Thus minded,' Auth., Coverd. (Test.), Bish., Rhem.; 'feele we this thing,' Wicl.; 'thus wyse minded,' Tynd., Cov., Crun., Gen. Are differently] ' Be otherwise,' Auth. and the other VV. except Wicl., s understonden in other maner ony thing.'

This will
God, elc.] 'God shall reveal even this unto you,' Auth. and, in the same order, with some slight variations of language, the other Vv. except Wicl., 'this thing God schal schewe;' Rhem., 'this also God hath reuealed,' - a singular mistranslation.
16. Attained] 'Already attained,' Author.; 'han commun,' Wicl.; 'are come,' Tynd., Cov., Gen., Rhem.; 'attained unto,' Bish. In the same direction, etc.] '*Let us walk by the same rule, let us mind the same thing,' Auth. The verse is obscure from its brevity; the translation 'to what point we have attained, - in the same direction, etc.,' perhaps may slightly clear it up, but is inferior to Author. in giving too special a meaning to eis ö.
17. Are walking] 'Walk,' Auth. and
are walking so as ye have us for an ensample. ${ }^{18}$ For many walk, of whom many times I used to tell you and now tell you even weeping, that they are the enemies of the cross of Christ: ${ }^{19}$ Whose end is perdition, whose God is their belly, and whose glory is in their shame, who are minding earthly things. ${ }^{20}$ For our coun..... wealth is in hearen ; from whence we also tarry for a Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ: ${ }^{21}$ Who shall transform the body of our humiliation so that it be fashioned like unto the body of His glory, according to the working whereby He is able even to subdue all things unto Himself.

## CHAPTER IV.

Wirerefore, my brethren dearly beloved and longed for, my joy and crown, so stand fast in the Lord, dearly beloved.
${ }^{2}$ I exhort Euodia, and I exhort Syntyche, that they be of the same mind in the Lord. ${ }^{3}$ Yea I entreat thee also, true yoke-fel-
all the Vv. It seems desirable to make some slight distinction between the pres. participle in this verse and the present indic. in ver. 18.
18. Many times I used, etc.] 'Have told you often,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Wiel., 'I have seide ofte to you;' Rhem., 'often I told you of.' Change to preserve the true force of ${ }^{\prime} \lambda \in \gamma o v$, and the

19. Perdition] 'Destruction,' Author., Rhem. ; 'deeth,' Wicl., Coverd. ('Test.) ; ' dampnacion,' Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen., Bish. Compare on 1 Tim. vi. 9. Are minding] 'Minde,' Author., Coverd. (Test.), Bish., Rhem. ; 'saueren,' Wicl.; 'are worldely mynded,' Tynd., Cranm., Gen. ; 'are earthly minded,' Cov.
20. Commonwealth] 'Conversation,' Author, and all the Vv. except Wicl., 'lyuyng.' We also tarry for, etc.] 'Also we look for the Saviour,' Auth., Gen., Bish.; 'also we abiden the sauyour,' Wicl.; ' we loke for a saveour, even, etc.,' Tynd., Coverd. (' the sav. J. C.') ; ' we do wayte for the saucoure the Lord J. C.,' Cov. (Test.) ; ' we loke for
the s., even the Lord J. C.,' Cran. ; 'we expect the Saviour our Lord J. C.,' Rhem.
21. Transform] 'Change,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Wicl., Rhem., 'refourme;' Cov. (Test.), 'restore.' Body of our humiliation] Sim. Rhem., 'body of our humilitie;'. Wicl., 'bodi of oure mekenesse :' 'vile body,' Auth. and the remaining Vv. So that it be] '*That it may be,' Auth. Body of His glory] So Rhem., and sim. Wicl., 'bodi of his clereness :' 'glorious body;' Author, and the remaining Vv. except Cov. (Test.), 'hys cleare body.'

Chapter IV. 1. Wherefore] So Cov. (both) : 'therefore,' Author. and the remäining $V_{v}$. The more exact translation, 'so then,' is here somewhat awkward on account of the following 'so.' Dearly bel. (2nd)] Auth. prefixes 'my,' with Bish., Rhem. ; 'most dere britheren,' Wicl.; 'ye beloved,' Tynd., and the remaining Vv.
2. Exhort] "Beseech,' Auth., Coverd., (Test.) ; 'prcie,' Wicl. and the remain-
low, give them aid, since they labored with me in the gospel, in company with Clement also, and the rest of my fellow-laborers whose names are in the book of life.
${ }^{4}$ Rejoice in the Lord alway: again I will say, Rejoice. ${ }^{\text {² }}$ Let your forbearance be known unto all men. The Lord is at hand. ${ }^{6}$ Be anxious about nothing ; but in every thing by your prayer and your supplication with thanksgiving let your requests be made known before God. ${ }^{7}$ And the peace of God, which passeth all understandings, shall keep jour hearts and your thoughts in Christ Jesus.
${ }^{8}$ Finally, brethren, whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things
ing Vv.' except Rhem., 'desire.' As тарака $\lambda \bar{\omega}$ is a word of , very frequent occurrence in St. Paul's Epp. (compare notes on 1 Tim. i. 3), the translation must vary with the context: here perhaps the slightly stronger ' exhort' is more suitable than the (now) weaker 'beseech.'
3. Yea] (*And,' Auth. (кà̀ ¢̣े.)

Give them aid, etc.] ' Help those women which,' Auth., Cov. (Test.), Bish., Rhem. (' that') ; 'the ilke wymmen that,' Wid.; 'the wemen which,' Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen.

In company with]
' With,' Auth, and all the other Vv.
The rest of] Sim. Rhem., 'the rest my:' 'with other,' Auth., Tynd., Cov., Crani, Genev., Bish.; ' and other,' Wicl.; 'my other,' $C o v$. (both).
4. Again] So Rhem., Coverd. (Test.), Bish., and sim. Wicl., 'efte:' 'and again,' Authe and the remaining $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$.
I will say] So Bish.: 'I say,' Auth' and all the other V v.
5. Forbearance] 'Moderation,' Auth.; 'pacience,' Wicl.; 'softeness,' Tynd., Cov. (both), Cranm. ; 'patient mynde,' Gen., Bish. ; 'modestic,' Rhem.
6. Anxious about] 'Careful for,' Auth., Cranm., Bish.; ' 'no thing bisie,' Wicl.; ' not carfull,' Tynd., Cov., Gen.; ' nothynge carcfull,' Cov. (Test.), Rhem. Your (twice)] Auth. and the other $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{Y}}$. simply ' prayer and supplication' ( Wricl.,
'bisechinge '). The Versions which erroneously connect $\pi$ avrl with $\pi \rho \sigma \sigma \epsilon u \chi \hat{?}$ are Wicl., Coverd. (Test.), and, what is singular, Crann., as this Version was not from the Vulgate, and was preceded by the correct translations of Tynd. and Cov.

Before] So Coverd. : 'unto,' Author. and the remaining Vv. except .Wicl., 'at ;' Rhemish; 'with.' Though not perfectly exact, the above translation of $\pi \rho \partial s$ is slightly preferable to 'unto,' as not seeming to imply to the Englislı reader that a dat. is used in the original.
7. All understandings] 'All understanding,' Auth. and. all the Vv. ( Wicl., 'witte'). As these words are so familiar to Christian cars, it seems desirable to introduce the slightest possible change consistent with accuracy. This scems to be the change to the plural, as it approximately conveys the meaning of тג́vea yồv (comp. notes on Col: ii. 15), and precludes the ordinary misconception that ' understanding'' is a participle. Your thoughts] 'Minds,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Wicl., Coverd. (Test.), 'undirstondingis ;' Rheem., 'intelligences.' $\left.\quad{ }^{n}\right]$ So Wiel., Tynd., Coverd. (both), Genev., Bish., Rhemish: 'through,' Auth., Cran., Bish.
8. Seemly] 'Honest,' Author, and the other Vv. except Wicl., 'chast.'
are scemly, whatsocver things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lurel; whatsoever things are of gool report; if there be any virtue, and if there be any praise, think on these things. ${ }^{9}$ The things, which ye also learned and received, and hearl, and saw in me, the same do : and the God of peace shall be with you.
${ }^{10}$ Now I rejoiced in the Lord greatly, that now at length ye flourished again in respect of your care for me, wherein ye were also careful, but ye lacked opportunity. ${ }^{11}$ Not that I speak in conseruence of want: for I have learned, in what state I am, therein to be content. ${ }^{12}$ I know also how to be abased, I know too how
9. The flings] So Cov. (Test.), where also it is similarly resumed as in text by 'the same:' 'those things,' Author.; 'which,' Tynd. and the remaining $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$. except Wicl., 'that.'

Also
learned] Similarly Widl,, 'also ye han lerned:' 'have both learned,' Auth. and the remaining $V \mathrm{v}$.

Saw]
'Seen,' Author. do] So Cov. (Test.), 'do the same,' and sim. Tynd., Cov., Cranm., Gen., Bish., 'those thynges do;' Rhemish, 'these things do ye' (Wiel. inverts order): 'do,' Auth.
10. Now] 'But,' Auth., Wicl., Cov. (Test.), Bish.; 'and,' Rhem.; the rest omit. At length] Sim. Rhern., 'at the length :' 'at the last,' Auth. and the other $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$. except Wiel., 'sumtyme aftirward.'

Ye fourished again, etc.] ' Your care of me hath flourished again,' Auth. ; ' ye flouriden agen to fele for me,' Wicl. ; ' ye are revived agayne to care for me,' Tynd., Coverd., Genev., Bish.; 'ye are flouryshynge agayne to regarde me,' Coverd. (Test.); ' your care is reuyued againe for me,' Cran.; 'you have reflourished to care for me,' Rhem.
11. In consequence of] 'In respect of,' Auth.; 'as for,' Wicl.; 'because of,' Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen., Bish. ; 'as because of,' Cov. (Test.) ; 'as it were for,'

Rhem. The translation in the text is probably a modern form of expression, but is appy. exact : the Auth. though not incorrect is somewhat ambiguous.
What state] Sim. Coverd. (Test.), 'what cases :' 'whatsoever state,' Author. and the remaining $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$. ('estate') except Wicl., 'to be sufficient in whiche thingis I am;' Rhem., 'to be content with the things that I have.' Therein] 'Therewith,' Author. and the other $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$. except Wicl., Rhem. (see above), and Cov. (Test.), which omits.
12. Know also] '*Know both,' Auth., Rhem. ; 'can also,' Wicl. ; 'can both,' Tynd., Coverd. ' (Test.); Cranm.; 'can,' Coverd., Gen.; 'knowe how,' Bish. It may here be remarked in passing that the position of kal in Greek, and that of 'also,' 'even,' or ' too,' in English, will not always exactly correspond. Here, for instance, kal belongs to tarelvovõau (see notes), whereas in English the 'also' seems idiomatically to take an earlier place in the sentence, and in position to connect itself with 'know:' the translation in the notes, 'know how also to be abased, or to be abased also,' is literal, but scarcely idiomatic. The attention of the student is directed to this point, as it requires some discrimination to perceive when it is positively necessary to retain in translation the position of
to abound : in every thing and in all things I have been fully taught both to be full and to be hungry, both to abound and to suffer need. ${ }^{15}$ I can do all things in Him that strengtheneth me. ${ }^{14}$ Notwithstanding ye did well that ye bare part with my affliction. ${ }^{15}$ Moreover, Philippians, yourselves also know that in the begiming of the gospel, when I departed from Macedonia, no church communicated with me as touching any account of giving and receiving, but ye only: ${ }^{16}$ since even in Thessalonica ye sent to me both once and again unto my necessity. ${ }^{17}$ Not that I seek after your gift ; but
kal, and when to yield to a more usual English collocation.

I know too] ' And I know,' Author., Bish.; 'I can also,' Wicl., Tynd. ; 'and I can,' Cov. (both), Cranm., Genev. ; 'I know also,' Rhem.

In every thing, etc.] 'Every where and in all things,' Auth. and the other Vv. (Gen. omits 'and'). Have been fully targht] Sim. Wicl., Cov. (Tcst.), 'I am taughte:' 'am instructed,' Auth. and the remaining Vv.
13. In Him that] '*Through Christ which,' Author., Coverd., Cranm., Bish.; ' thorow the helpe,' Tynd., Gen.
Strengtheneth] So Auth. and all Vv. except Wicl. and Cov. (Test.), 'coumfortith.' The force of $\begin{gathered} \\ e \\ \nu \\ \delta \\ \text { p }\end{gathered}$. cannot be expressed without weakening the emphasis of the verse, and impairing the rhythm.
14. Did well] 'Have well done,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Wicl., Coverd. (both), Rhem., 'han don wel.'
Bare part with]. So Cov. (Test.), 'bearynge parte wyth,' and sim. Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen., ' ye bare part with me in :' ' communicated with,' Auth.; 'did communicate to,' Bish: ; 'communicating to,' Rhem.
15. Moreover, Philippians, etc.] 'Now ye Phil. know also,' Auth., and sim. Cov . (Test.), Gen., ' and ye, ctc. ;' 'for ye filipensis witen also,' Wicl.; 'ye of Philippos knowe that,' Tynd., Cov., Cranm., ('also that'); 'ye Philip. knowe also,' Bish.; 'and you also know, O Philipp.,' Rhem.

As touching any, etc.]
'As concerning giving and receiving,' Author., Tynd., Cov. (omits 'as'), Cran., Gen., Bish.; 'in resoun of thing gouun and takun,' Wicl.; 'in the way of gyfte and receate,' Coverd. (Test.) ; ' in the account of, etc.,' Rhem. Perhaps the insertion of the indefinite 'any ' may be considered permissible as serving slightly to clear up the meaning; neither ' an account' or 'the account' (Rhem.) is free from oljections.
16. Since] 'For,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Wicl., which omits the conjunction.

To me] So Wicl.: Auth. and all the other Vv. omit.
Both once] ' (ince,' Author. and the other Vv.

Unto] So Auth. and all
Vv. ( Wicl., ' in to ; 'Rhem., 'to ') except Coverd. (Test.), 'to my behofe.' It is a matter of grave consideration whether, in a literal but idiomatic translation like the Authorized Version, we can consistently introduce here and in similar passages such periphrastic yet practically correct translations of $\epsilon$ is as 'to supply,' 'to meet,' etc. As there might seem to be some difficulty in fixing the limits of such periphrases, and as the older $V_{V}$. appear to have but seldom adopted such transl., it is perhaps best in the majority of cases to retain the more literal, though sometimes less intelligible rendering.
17. That] So Tynd., Coverd. (both), Cranm., Geni, Bish., Rhem.: 'because,' Auth.; ' for,' Wicl.

Seck after (twice)] 'SDesire,' Auth. and the other

I seck afte: the fruit that multiplieth unto your accouni. ${ }^{18}$ But I have all things and abound: I am full now that I have received from Epaplroditus the things which came from you, a savor of sweet smell, a sacrifice acceptable, well-pleasing to Gol. ${ }^{19}$ But my God shall supply every need of yours according to 1 is riches, with glory in Christ Jesus. ${ }^{20}$ Now unto God and our Father be glory for ever and ever. Amen.
${ }^{21}$ Salute every saint in Christ Jesus. The brethren which are with me salute you. ${ }^{22}$ All the saints salute you, but especially they that are of Cæssar's household.
${ }^{23}$ The grace of the Lord Jesus Cluist be with your spirit.

Vv. except Wicl., Cos, (hoth), Rllem., 'seke.' Your gift] ' I gift,' Author., Bish. ; 'gifre,' Wicl., Coverd.; 'gyftes,' Tynd., Cran. ; 'the gifte,' Cov. (Test.), Rhem.; 'a rewarde,' Gen. It is doubtful whether the plural translation. of Tynd. and Cranm. does not practically convey more clearly than the text the meaning of the present article, 'the gift in the particular case,' i. e. 'gifts,' or even 'any gift;' compare notes: such translations, however, involve principles of correction that should be admitted with great caution.

The fruit] So Coverd.; Gen., Rhem. ; 'fruit,' Auth., Wicl., Bish. ; ' aboundant frute,' Tynd. Chan.; 'plentyfull frute,' Coverd. (Test.).

That multiplielk]
' That may abound,' Author., and sim. Gen., 'which may forther;' 'abounding,' Wicl., Bish., Rhem. The change is of no importance, but made to preserve in the translation the different words used in the original, here and in ver. $18,-\pi \lambda \epsilon \sigma \nu a ́ \zeta \epsilon \iota \nu$ and $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \sigma \sigma \epsilon \dot{v} \epsilon \iota \nu$. Unto] 'To,' Auth.
18. All things] So Wicl., Rhemish: ' all,' Auth. and the remaining Vv. The present translation of ảmé $\chi \omega$ (Author. Wicl., Cov. (both), Bish., Rhem.) is unduly weak (Tynd., Cranm., Gen., omit 'have'); but the more literal translation, 'I have in full,' 'I have for my own,' seems as unduly strong, and some-
what interferes with the brief and climactic character of the first portion of the verse. Now that, etc.] Sim. Tyncl., Gen., Bish., 'after that I had rec. :' Cov. ' whan I rec.; ' Cov. (Test.), 'whan I had received;' Cranm., 'after that I received;' Rhem., 'after I received.' From] 'Of,' Auth. and all Vv.
Which came] So Tynd., Coverd., Gen.: 'whlich were sent from,' Author., Cranm., Bish. ; 'which ye senten,' Wicl., and sim. Goverd. (Test.), Rhem.
Sacor of sweet smell] Sim. Cor:: (Test.), 'a savoure of swetness:' ' of a sweet smell,' Auth., Cran.; 'odour of swetnesse,' Wicl.: 'an odour that smelleth swete,' Tynd., Gen. ; ' odour of sweeteness,' Cov., Rhem. ; 'an odour of a sweete smell,' Bish.
19. With glory] 'In glory,' Author., Wicl., Cov. (both), Bish., Rhem. ; 'glorious riches,' Tynd., Cran., Gen. In] So Wicl., Tynd., Cov. (both), Gen., Bish., Rhem. : 'by,' Auth., Cran.
21. Salute yout So Coverd. (both), Rhem.: ' greet,' Auth. and the remaining V v . A change of translation in the same verse does not scem desirable.
22. But especially] So Coverd. (both), Rhem.: 'chicfly,' Auth.: 'moost sothli,' Wicl.; 'and most of all,' Tynd., Gen.; 'most of all,' Cran., Bish.
23. The Lord] '*Our Lord,' Auth. Your spirit] '* You all, Amen,' Auth.

## THE EPISTLE TO TIIE COLOSSIANS.

## CHAPTERI.

PAUL, an apostle of Christ Jesus by the will of God, and Timothy our brother, ${ }^{2}$ to the saints in Colossæ and faithful brethren in Christ: grace be unto you and peace, from God our Father.
${ }^{3}$ We give thanks to God the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, praying always for you, ${ }^{4}$ having heard of your faith in Christ Jesus, and of the love which ye have to all the saints, ${ }^{5}$ because of the hope which is laid upfor you in heaven, whereof ye heard be-

Chapter I. 1. Chwist Jesus] (*Jesus Christ,' Auth. Tinothy] So Wicl., Cov. (Test.), Rhem.: 'Timotheus,' Author. and the remaining $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$. The principle put forward in the preface to Auth., though apparently not always followed, seems sound and reasonable, -to adopt, in the case of proper names, those forms which are most current, and by which the bearers of the names are most popularly known.
2. Saints in Colossce] Sim. Tyndule, Cov., Cran., 'sayntes which are at Colossæ:' 'to the saints and faithful brethren in Christ which are at Colosse,' Auth. and, with slight variations in order, the remaining $\mathrm{Vv}_{\mathrm{v}}$.
Father] Auth. adds '*and the Lord Jesus Christ.'
3. ('od the Father] '*God and the Father,' Auth.
4. Having heard] 'Since we heard,' Auth., Tynd., Cov., Gen., Bish. ( 'have') ; 'herynge,' Wicl., Cov. (Test.), Rhem.;
'for we haue hearde,' Cran. The translation of Auth., al. is perhaps somewhat ambiguous, 'since' having as much a causal as a temporal reference. As the latter seems to be the most probable refcrence in the present case (see notes in loc.), it will perhaps be best to adopt what seems a more definitely temporal translation; see notes on Phil. ii. 30 (Transl.). To all] So Auth. A few of the $\mathrm{Vv}_{1,}$ Cov. (Test.), Rhem., retain the more literal 'toward.'
5. Because of] So Cov. (Test.) ; 'for,' Author., Wicl., Rhem.; ' for the hope's sake,' Tynd., Coverd., Cran., Gen., Bish. Word of truth, etc.] So Cov. except that $\epsilon^{\circ} \nu\left(1^{\text {st }}\right)$ is translated 'by,' and similarly Gen., 'the worde of truth which is in the gospel:' 'word of the truth of the gospel,' Author., Wicl., Rhem.; 'true worde of the gospell,' Tynd., Cranm.; 'worde of truth of the gospel,' Coverd. (Test.), Bish. The true relation of the genitives thus seems expressed by three
fore in the word of Truth in the gospel ; ${ }^{6}$ which is come unto you, as it is also in all the world ; and is lringing forth fruit and increasing as it is also in you, since the day ye heard of $i t$, and came to know the grace of God in truth : "even as ye learned of Epaphras our beloved fellow-servant, who is in your behalf a FAITHFUL minister of Christ ; ${ }^{8}$ who also declared unto us your love in the Spirit.
${ }^{9}$ For this cause we also, since the day we heard $i t$, do not cease to pray for you, and to make our petition that ye may be filled with the knowledge of His will in all spiritual wisdom and understancling; ${ }^{10}$ that ye may walk worthy of the Lord unto all pleasing, bringing forth fruit in every good work, and increasing by the knowledlge of God; ${ }^{11}$ being strengthened with all strength, accord-
of the older $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$.; see notes. The articlo preceding $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \vartheta$ धias appears only to mark that $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \hat{\eta}$. is used in its most abstract sense. This use of the articlo in the case of abstract nouns is commonly marked in this Revision by a capital letter.
6. It is also ( $(1 s t)]^{\text {t }}$ ) So Cov. (Test.), and sim. Wicl., 'also it is;' Rhem., 'also in the whole world it is :' 'it is,' Auth. and the remaining $\mathrm{V} v$.
Is bringing forth fruit] 'Bringeth forth' fruit,' Auth., Cov., Test. (omits 'forth'); 'makith frute,' Wicl.; 'is frutefull,' Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen., Bish.; 'fructifieth,' Rhem.
Auth. *omits.
Auth.
And increasing]
1s] ' Doth,' Auth and the remaining V v . (Coverd Test., 'haue knowen') except Tynd., Cran., 'had experience'- a translation which similarly with text endeavors to express the force of ${ }^{\frac{2}{2} \pi} \boldsymbol{\pi} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \gamma \nu \omega \tau \in$ (see notes on ver. 9), and descrves consideration.
7. Even as ye] Author. adds ' '*also,' and omits 'even.' The translation of каэง $\mathbf{w} s$, whether ' as' or 'even as,' must depend on the general tone of the passage: liere the latter seems to connect the present verse a little more elosely, with the concluding words of ver. 6.

Beloved] 'Dear,' Auth., Tynd., Coverd., Cran., Gen., Bish.; ' moost dereworthe,' Wicl.; 'mooste beloucd,' Cov. (Test.); 'deerest,' Rhem.

In your belialf] 'For you,' Auth. and the remaining Vv. It seems desirable to select a translation that should prevent $\dot{\tilde{\tau} \pi \mathrm{e} \rho} \mathrm{b}$ bing possibly understood as 'in your place;' see notes.
9. Make our petition] 'Desire,' Auth. and the other Vv. (Tynd., Rhem.,' desyringe ') except Wicl., 'to axe;' Cov. (Test.), 'axing.' May] So Coverd. (Test.), Rhem: 'might,' Auth. and the remaining Vv. except Wicl., 'that ye be filled.' Spiritual wisdom and, etc.] So Cov. (Test.) : 'wisdom and spiritual understanding,' Auth. and all the remaining Vr .
10. May] So Coverd. (Test.), Rhem.: 'might,' Author. and the remaining Vv. except Wicl., 'that ye walke.'
Bringing forth fruit] So Cov. (Test.): 'being fruitful,' Auth. It seems desirable to preserve the same translation as in ver. 6.

By the] '*In the,' Auth.
11. Being strengthened] So Coverdale (Test.) : 'strengthened,' Author, and the remaining Vv. except. Wicl., 'and be comfortid ; ' Cov., ' and to be strong.'
iag to the might of His glory, unto all patience and long-suffering wilh joy; ${ }^{12}$ giving thanks unto the Father, which made us meet for the portion of the inheritance of the saints in light: ${ }^{13}$ who delivered us out of the power of darkness, and translated us into the kingrlom of the Son of His love; ${ }^{1 t}$ in whom we have Redemption, even the forgiveness of our sius. ${ }^{15}$ Who is the image of the invisible Gocl, the firstborn before every creature: ${ }^{16}$ because in Him were all things created, the things that are in heaven, and the things that are on earth, the things visible and the things invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers, - all things have been created by Him, and

Strength] ' Might,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Wicl., 'vertu ; ' Cov. (both), 'power.' It is perhaps desirable to retain the тарท́x $\eta$ ots of the original.
The mighte of His glory] So Cov. (both), Rhem., and sim. Wicl., 'migt of His tlerenesse:' 'glorious power,' Auth. and the remaining $\bigvee \mathrm{V}$.
So Wicl., Rhem., and, with a different collocation, Coo. (Test.) : 'joyfulness,' Author, and the remaining Vr.: comp. notes on Plil. ii. 29 (Transl.).
12. Made] So Wicl.: 'hath made,' Auth. and the remaining V .
For the portion] 'To be partakers of,' Auth., Tynd., Cranm., Gen., Bish.; 'to the part of,' Wicl. ; ' mete for the inheritance,' Cov.: 'worthy of the parto of the enh.;' Coverd. (Test.); ' worthy unto the part of the lot,' Rhem.
13. Delivered] So Wicl:: 'hath delivered,' Auth. and the remaining Vv. except Goverd. (Test.), 'hath drawen us oute. - Out of] 'From,' Auth. Translated] So Wicl., Coverd.: 'hath translated,' Auth. and the remaining $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$. The Son of His love] So Rhem., and sim. Wicl., 'the sone of His louynge:' 'His dear Son,' Auth. and the remaining Vv. except Cov. (Test.), 'Hys beloued Sonne.?
14. Redemption] Auth. adds '*through His blood.'

Our
sins] 'Sins,' Auth. and all the other $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{V}}$.
15. Firstborn] So Auth., Cov. (Test.), Bish., Rhem.; 'first begotten,' Wicl., Tynd., Cov., Cranm., Gen. It is apparently not of much moment which of these expressions is adopted, as the meaning is substantially the same. In Rom. viii. 29, Auth. adopts the former, in Rev. i. 5, the latter: in expressions of this peculiar and mystical nature it seems desirable to preserve a uniform translation.

Before] So Cov. (Test.) : 'of,' Author. and remaining Vv. This latter translation was retained in ed. 1 , as most inclusive; the arguments, however, for the translation in the text (see notes) seem sufficiently strong to justify the alteration.
16. Because] 'For,' Auth. and all the other Vv. In] So Wicl:, Rhem. : 'by,' Auth. and the remaining $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{V}}$.

The things that are] That are in heaven and that are in earth, visible and invisible,' Auth., Cran., Bish., and, with some slight variations, Wicl., Cov., Gen., Rhem.: Tynd. alone inserts 'things,' four times as in the text. The repetition seems to give emphasis to the enumeration ; see notes on Eph. i. 10 (Transl.).

Have been created] 'Were created,' Author., Cran., Gen., Bish., Rhem. ; 'ben made of nought,' Wicl.; ' are created,' Tynd.;
for Him ; ${ }^{17}$ and He is before all things, and in Him all things subsist. ${ }^{18}$ And He is the head of the body, the church; who is the beginning, the firstborn from the dead, in order that in all thinys He might have the pre-eminence: ${ }^{19}$ because in Him it pleased the whole fulness of the Godliead to dwell, ${ }^{20}$ and by Him to reconcile all things unto Himself, having made peace through the blood of His cross ; by IIim, I say, whether they be the things on earth, or the things in heaven.
${ }^{21}$ And you also, though ye were in times past alienated and

Cov. (both). As the Greek perfect expresses both 'have been' and 'are ;' there is sometimes a difficulty in knowing which of the two to select: perhaps as a general rule (where idiom will permit, and there is no danger of misconception) it is best to adopt the former when past time seems to come more in prominence, the latter when present effects are more immediately the subject of considcration. To apply this to the present case; as the former part of the verse seems to show that the reference is perhaps more to the past than to present operations of the Divine power, these latter being more alluded to in the following verse, - we may perhaps judiciously change the 'are created' of ed. 1 into the translation now adopted in the text. On the translation of $\delta i$ airov, see Revised Transl. of St. John, p. xiii.
17. In] So Wicl., Tynd., Cov. (both), Gen., Bish., Rhem.: 'by,' Auth., Cran. Subsist] 'Consist,' Auth.
18. Who] So Auth., Rhem., Wicl., and Cov. Test. ('whyche') ; 'he is the beg.' Tynd., Cov., Cranm., Gen., Bish. The relative translation is scarcely sufficient, as it does not fully convey the explanatory force in the relative 'being as He is.' As, however, the translation in the commentary 'seeing He is,' though per se expressing clearly this force of $8 s$, is perhaps somewhat too strong when placed in connection with what precedes and follows, it seems better to leave

Auth. unchanged. In order that] 'That,' Author. and all the other Vv. The occasional insertion of 'in order' seems useful where it is required to exhibit clearly the purpose involved in the antecedents.
19. Because in Him, etc.] So similarly Wicl., ' in Hym it plesid alle plentee to enhabite ;' Coverd. (Test.), 'it hath pleased alle fulnesse of the Godheade to dwel in Iyyn ;' Rhem., 'it hath wel pleased al fulness to inhabite:' 'for it pleased the Futher that in Him should all fulness dwell,' Auth. and the remaining Vv. (Coverd., 'shuld dwoll all f.').
20. Having made - cross] Auth. places this clause in the first part of the verse, immediately after 'and.' All the other Vv. retain the order of the Greek, but with some variations in the translation of the participle. The things
on earth] 'Things in earth,' Auth.
The things in] 'Things in,' Auth.
21. And you also] 'And you,' Author. and all the other Vv. On this translation of kal, sce notes on Eph. ii. 1.
Though ye were, etc.] Similarly Rhem., 'whereas you were;' compare Wicl., Cov. (Test.), 'whanne ye weren :' 'that were,' Auth.; 'whiche were,' Tynd. and the remaining Vr .

In times
past] So Tynd., Cov., Gen. : sometime,' Auth. and the remaining Vv.
Understanding] So Auth. in Eph. iv. 18 ; 'mind,' Auth., and sim. remaining Vv. except Wicl., Coverd. (Test.), 'witte;'.
enemies in your understanding in wreked works, yet now hath He recouciled ${ }^{22}$ in the body of His flesh through His death, to present you holy and blameless and without charge in His sight: ${ }^{23}$ if at least ye continue in the faith, grounded and stable, and without being moved away from the hope of the gospel, which ye heard, and which was preached in the lecaring of every creature which is under heaven; whereof I Paul became a minister.
${ }^{24}$ Now I rejoice in my sufferings for you, and am filling fully up the lacking mieasures of the afflictions of Christ in my flesh for His body's sake, which is the church : ${ }^{25}$ whereof I became a minister, according to the dispensation of God which was given to me for you, to fulfil the word of God ; ${ }^{26}$ even the mystery which hath lain hid from the ages and from the generations, but now hath been made manifest to His saints : ${ }^{2 \pi}$ to whom it was God's will to make
' by cogitation,' Bish.: Rhem. 'sense.' $\left.I_{n}\right]$ So Wicl,, Rhem., and, with a different construction, Tynd., Coo., Cranm., Gen., Bish.: ' by,' Author.: 'geuen to, cte.' Coo. (Test.).
22. His deuth] ' Death,' Auth. and all the other $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{V}}$. Blameless and without charge] ' Unblamable and unreprovable,' Author.; 'unwemmed and without repreef,' Wicl. ; 'unblameable and without faut,' Tynnd., Coverd., Cran., Gen., Bish. ; 'unspotted and unblamear. ble,' Coverd. (Test.) ; 'immaculate and blameless,' Rhem.
23. If at least] 'If,' Auth. and the remaining $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$. except Wicl., 'if netheles;' Rhem., 'if yet.'

Stable\} So Wicl., Rhem.: 'settled,' Author.; 'stablysshed,' Tynd. and the remaining $\mathrm{Vv}_{\mathrm{v}}$.
Without being] 'Be not,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Wicl., Coverd. (Test.), Rhem., 'unmouable.' Heard] 'Have heard,' Author. and all the other Vv. Auth., Genev., Bish.; 'in al creaturis,' Wicl.; 'amonge all creatures,' Tynd., Cov., Cranm., Rhem.; 'among euery creature,' Cov. (Test.).

Paul become:' 'am made,' Auth. and the remaining $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{r}}$.
24. Now $I$ ] '*Who now,' Auth. Am filling fully up]. 'Fill up,' Author:; 'fille,' Wicl.; 'fulfill,' Tynd.; Coverd. (both), Cranm., Gien., Bish.; ‘accomplish,' Rhem. The lacking measures of ] 'That which is behind of,' Auth., Tynd., Cov., Cranm.; Bish.; 'the thingis that failen of,' Wicl.; 'the thynges that are wantynge of,' Coverd. (Test.), sim. Rhem.; 'the rest of,' Gen.
25. Became] Similarly Cov. (Test.), 'am become:' 'am made,' Auth. and the remaining $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{r}}$. Was given] So Tynd., Cranm.: 'is given,' Auth. and the remaining $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$.
26. Lain] 'Been,' Author. Perhaps the slight change may better convey the force of the perf: participle.
From the ages and from the gen.] 'From ages and from gen.,' Author., Wicl., Rhem.; Tynd., Cov., Cranm., Gen., and Bish., paraphrase; 'from euerlastynge and the generacions,' Cov. (Test.).
Hath been] ' Is,' Auth. and all the other Vv.
27. It was God's will] 'God would,' Auth. and all the other $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$.
known what is the riches of the glory of this mystery among the Gentiles ; which is Christ among you, the hope of Glory: ${ }^{2 s}$ whom we proclaim, warning every man, and teaching every man in all wisdom ; that we may present every man perfect in Christ: ${ }^{29}$ to which end I also toil, striving according to His working, which worketh in me with power.

## CHAPTERII.

For I would have you know what great conflict I have for you, and them in Laudicea, and as many as have not seen my face in the flesh; ${ }^{2}$ that their hearts may be comforted, they being knit together in love and unto all the riches of the full assurance of the understanding, unto the full knowleclge of the mystery of God, even Christ; ${ }^{3}$ in whom are hiddenly all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge. ${ }^{4}$ Now this I say, that no one may beguile jou with

Among (2a)] So Corerd. (Test.): 'in,' Auth. and the remaining $\mathrm{Vr}_{\mathrm{r}}$. Christ] ‘*Christ Jesus,' Auth.
28. Proclaim] 'Preach,' Author. and the other Vv. except Wicl., 'schewen.'
29. To which end] ‘Whereunto,' Authl., Gen., Bish.; 'in whiche thing,' Wicl.; 'wherin,' Tynd., Coverd. (both), Cran., Rhem. Toil] Comp. on 1 Tim. iv. 10 : 'labor,' Auth. and all Vv. except Wicl., ' traueilo.'
With power] Similarly Cov. (Test.), 'by power:' Rhem., 'in power:' ' mightily,' Author. and the remaining $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{r}}$. except Wicl., ' in vertu.'

Chapter II. 1. Would have you, etc.] Similarly Cov. (Test.), 'would have you to know ;' Rhem., ' wil haue you know :' 'would that ye knew,' Author., Cranm., Bish.; 'wole that ye wite,' Wiclif'; 'wolde ye knewe,' Tynd., Cov., Gen. And them] ' And for them,' Auth. In] 'At,' Auth., Wicl., Cranm., Coverd. (Test.), Bish., Rhem.; ' of,' Tynd., Cov., Gen. . And as many] 'And for as many,' Auth.
2. May] So Coverd. (Test.), Rhem.; 'might,' Author. and the remaining Vv. except Wicl., 'that her hertis counforted.' They being, etc.] '*Being knit together,' Author. The riches] So Wicl., Cov. (Test.), Rhem.; 'riches,' Auth. and the remaining $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$. The understanding] Author, and all the other Vr. omit the article ; 'full understondinge,' Tynd., Cov., Cran.; 'persuaded underst.,' Gen. Unto] 'To,' Auth.: change to preserve parallelism with the preeeding eis. Full lenowledge] 'Acknowledgment,' Auth.; 'knowynge,' Wicl.; 'for to knowe,' Tynd., Cranm., Gen.; ' knowledge,' Cov. (both), Cranm.; ' to know,' Bish. The juxtaposition of emify源s and $\gamma \nu \bar{\omega} \sigma t s$ seems here to justify this translation; comp. notes.
Of God, even Christ] 'Of Gord *and of the Father, and of Christ,' Auth.
3. Hiddenly] 'Hid,' Auth. and all the other $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$.
4. Now] 'And,' Author., Gen.; 'for,' Wicl. ; 'but,' Coverdale (Test.), Rhem.: Tynd., Cov., Cran., Bish. omit.
enticing speech. ${ }^{5}$ For if I am absent rerily in the flesh, yet still I am with you in the spirit, joying with you and beholding your order, and the firm foundation of your faith in Christ. ${ }^{6}$ As then ye receired Christ Jesus the Lond, so walk ye in IIm ; ${ }^{7}$ rooted and being built up in Him, and being stablished in your faith, even as ye were taught, abounding therein with thanksgiving.
${ }^{8}$ Beware lest there shall be any one that maketh you his booty through philosophy and vain deccit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ. ${ }^{9}$ Because in Hin doth divell in bodily fashion all the fulness of the Godhead. ${ }^{10}$ And ye are in Ilim made full; who is the head of every princi-

That no one] 'Lest *any one,' Author. May] 'Should,' Autl. and the other Vv. except Wicl., Cov. (Test.), Rhem., ' that no man disceyuc you.'
Enticing. speech] 'Enticing words,' Auth. and the otlier Vr. except Wicl., Coverd. (Test.), 'higthe of wordis;' Bish , 'persuasion of word;' Rhem., 'loftines of wordes.'
5. If 1 am alsent verily, etc.] 'Though I be absent,' Auth. and all the other Vv. Yet still I am] 'Yet am I,' Author. and the other $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{y} \text {. except } \mathrm{Cov} \text {. (Test.), 'but }}$ yet am I;' Rhem., ' yet in spirit I am:' Wich. omits.

Joying with youl 'Joying,' Author, and the other Vv. except Coverd. (Test.), Rhem., 'rejoycynge.' Firm foundation] 'Stedfastness,' Author., Coverd. (both); 'sadnesse,' Wiclif; 'stedfast fayth,' Tynd., Cran., Geen., Bish.: ‘ 'constancie,' Rhem.
6. As then ye] 'As ye have therefore,' Auth. and all the other Vv. ( Wicl, Rhem., 'therfor as yo han').
7. Being built up] Auth. and all the other Vv. either omit ' being,' or slightly change the construction. The insertion is an attempt to mark the difference of tense in the two participles. The true force of the tense in each case (as is suggested in notes in loc.) is very discernible; they had already been rooted and
were now remaining so (perf.) ; they were being built up (pres.) - the process going on from day to day. What was underneath was firm and was remaining so ; what was above was receiving continual increase and accession.
Being stablished] So Coverd. (Test.): Author, and the remaining $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$. cither omit ' being' or slightly change the construction. Your faith] 'The faith,' Author. and the other V v. except Wicl., 'the bileue;' Cov. (Test.), Crann., 'faith.'
8. There shall be any one that, etc.] 'Any man spoil you,' Auth., Cov., Bishi.; 'that no man disceyue you,' Wiclif, Rhem. ; ' eny man come and spoyle you,' Tynd., Gen.; 'ony man deceave you,' Cov. (Test.); 'lest be eny man spoyle you,' Cran.
9. Because] 'For,' Auth. and all the other V v. Doth dwell] 'Dwelleth,' Auth. and all the other Vr. The introduction of the auxiliary appears to add a slight force to the important verb катокке. The principal emphasis apparently falls on $\dot{\epsilon} \nu$ aùvê; the verb, however, both from meaning and position, is not without prominence.
In bodily fashion] ' Bodily,' Author. and the other $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$ except Rhem., ' corporally.'
10. In Him made fulld Sim. Rhem., 'in Him replenished:' 'complete in
pality and power: ${ }^{11}$ in whom ye were also circumcised with a circumeision not wrought with hand, in the putting off of the body of the flesh, in the circumcision of Christ; ${ }^{12}$ having been buried with Him in your baptism, wherein ye were also raised with Him through your faith in the operation of God, who raised llim from the dead. ${ }^{13}$ And you also being dead in your trespasses and the

Him,' Author. and the other Vv. except Wicl., Cov. (Test.), 'filled in Him.'
Who] 'Which,' Author. The otherwise unnecessary change adds here to perspicuity. Every] 'All,' Auth. and the other $\mathrm{Vv}_{\mathrm{v}}$.
11. Ye were also circumcised] ' Also ye are circ.,' Author. and the other Vv. except Rhem., ' also you are,' etc.
$A$ circumcision] So Coverd. (Test.), and sim. all the other $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$. (exeept Author.), 'circumcision :' Author. inserts the definite article. Not wrought with hand] 'Made without hands,' Author., Tynd., Genev., Bish.; ' not made with hond,' Wicl., Rhem. ('by '); ' circum. without hondes,' Coverd.; 'not made with handes,' Cov. (Test.); 'done without handes,' Cran.

In the
putting off, etc.] 'In putting off,' etc, Auth.; ' in dispoilynge of (off),' Wicl.; 'by puttinge of (off),' Tynd., Cov., Gen., Bish.; ' in robbyng of,' Cou. (Test.); ' for asmoch as, etc.,' Cranm.; ' in spoiling of,' Rhem. The insertion of the articles gives a heavincss to the sentence, but seems required to show that it $\tau \boldsymbol{\tau}$ àmek $\delta$. is not to be regarded as modal, much less causal, as Cranm.
Body of the flesh] 'Body *of the sins of the flesh,' Auth. In the circumcision] So Cov. (Test.), Rhem., and similarly Wicl., 'in circuméision :' ' by the circumcision,' Auth., Bish.; ' thorow the cire.,' Tynd., Cranm., Gien.; ' with the circ.,' Cov.
12. Having been buried] 'Buried,' Author., Bish., Rhem.; 'rand ye ben biried,' Wiel.; 'being buried,' Coverd. (Test.) ; 'in that ye are buried, etc.'

Tynd. and the remaining $\mathrm{V} v$. Compare notes on Phil. ii. ? (Transl.).
Your baptism] 'Baptism,' Auth. and all the other $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$. Ye. were also raised] ' Also ye are risen,' Auth., and with slight variations the other $\mathrm{Vv}_{\mathrm{v}}$ : the kal, however, is rightly joined in translation with $\sigma$ uvnүєpэ. by Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen., Bish.
Your faith] 'Faith,' Author. and, with some variations in construction, the other Vr. except Coverd. (Test.), Bishh, Rheim., 'the faith.' The personal address seemis here to render the translation of the article by the possessive pronoun correct and appropriate ; there are, however, many cases in which such attempts at accuracy overload and embarrass the sentence ; consider Romans xii. 7 sq., where, as in many other passages, it requires much discrimination to decide when the article has a pronominal force, and when it is merely associated with au abstract noun. In the operation] 'Of the operation,' Auth., Bish., Rhem.;: 'wrought by the operacion of,' Tynd., Coverd., Crumm., Gen.; ' of God's workynge,' Cov. (Test.). On the translation of this word see notes on 1 Thess. ii. 13: the rendering here adopted by Auttior. may perhaps be allowed to stand; the term 'operation,' though not usually a good translation, here not unsuitably representing the 'potentia in actum se exserens ' (Calv. on Phil. iii. 21) alluded to and exemplified in the clause which follows.
13. You also] Auth. and the other $\mathrm{Vv}_{\mathrm{v}}$. omit 'also:' see, however, notes on Eph. ii. 1. Trespasses] So
uncircumcision of your flesh, He quickened together with Himself, having forgiven us all our trespasses, ${ }^{1+}$ blotting out the handwriting in force against us by its decrees, which was contrary to us ; land He hath taken it out of the way, nailing it to His cross ; ${ }^{15}$ umul stripping away from Himself principalities and powers, He made a show of then with boldness, triumphing over them in it.
${ }^{16}$ Let not any man therefore judge you in eating or in drinking, or in the matter of an holy day, or of a new moon, or of a sabbath; ${ }^{17}$ which are a shadow of things to come, but the body is

Auth. in Eph. ii. 1, and in the present verse: 'sins,' Author., Corerd. (both), Bist.; ' 'giltis,' Wict.; 'synne,' Tynd., Cran., Gener.; 'the offenses,' Rhem.
He quichened] So Wicl., Cov., and sim. 1hhem., 'did he quicken:' ' hath he, etc.,' Auth. and the remaining V v .
Himself] 'Him,' Auth. and all the other $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$. $U_{s}$ ] '*You,' Auth.
Our trespasses] So Tynd., Cranm., Gen. ('your'), Bish. (' your') : 'trespasses,' Author.; ' giltis,' Vicl.; 'sins,' Coverd. (both) ; 'offenses,' Rhein.
14. Blotting out] So Author. As this participlo seems contemporary with the preceding, and to mark the circumstances under which the preceding aet took place, the present participle in English may be properly retained; comp. notes on Phil. ii. 7 (Transl.). The more exact, 'by having, etc.,' is open to the oljjection of being cumbrous, and perhaps unduly modal.

In force against us, etc.] ' Of ordinances that was against us,' Author.; 'that writynge of decre that was agens us,' Wicl.; 'the handwriting that was agaynst us contained in the lawe written,' Tynd., Cov., Cran.; 'the hande wrytynge that was againste us of the deine;' $\operatorname{Cov.}$ (Test.) ; 'the handwryting of cetemonies that was against us,' Gen., Bishl. ('ordinances '); 'the handwriting of decrees,' Rhem.
Hath taken] So Tynd., Cov., Cran., Bish., Rhem.: ' took,' Auth. and the remaining Vr. Auth. also omits the personal pro-
noun: the insertion of it, however, coupled with the slight cliange in punctuation, seems to clear up the construction, and render the connection of clauses somewhat more perspicuous.
15. Stripping, etc.] 'Having spoiled,' Auth., Bish., and sim. Coverd. (Test.), Rhem., 'spoiling ; ' 'and hath spoyled,' Tyncl. and the remaining Vv.
With boldness] Similarly Cov. (Test.), ' boldely;' Rhem., ' confidently:' 'openly,' Authorized and the remaining Versions.
16. Let not, etc.] 'Let no man therefore,' Author. and the other Vv. except Wicl., 'therfor no man juge.'
Eating or in drinking] 'Meat or in drink,' Auth., Wicl., Cov. (Test.) (omits 'in'), Bish., Rhem. ; ' meate and drinke,' Tynd., Cov. (' or'), Cran., Gen.
In the matter of] 'In respect of,' Autior:; in part of,' Wicl., Bish., Rhem.; ' for pece of,' 'Tynd., Cov., Crani, Gen ; 'in a part of,' Cov. (Test.). $\quad$ new snoon] ' The, etc.,' Author. and the other Vv. except Wicl., 'neomynyc.'
A salbath] 'Sabbath days,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Wicl, Cov. (Test.); Rhem., 'Sabotis.' As $\sigma \alpha \beta \beta a \tau \alpha$ is used with the force of a singular (Matth. xii. 1, Luke iv. 16, al.), and as the preceding terms are in the singular, it scems better to revert to that form in translation.
17. Christ's] So Cov. (Test.), Rhem.: 'of Christ,' Auth., Wicl., Bish.; 'is in Christ,' Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen.

Christ's. ${ }^{18}$ Let no man beguile you of your reward, desiring to do it in false lowliness of mind and worshi ping of the angels, intruding into the things which he hath not seen, vainly puffed up by the mind of his flesh, ${ }^{19}$ and not holding fast the Head, from which the whole body by means of its joints and bands having nourishment ministerel, and being knit together, increaseth with the increase of God. -- 20 If ye be deard with Christ from the rudiments of the world, why, as if ye were living in the world, do ye submit to ordinances, ${ }^{21}$ Handle not, nor taste, nor touch, ${ }^{22}$ (which things are all to be destroyed in their consumption), after the commandenents and
18. Desiring to do it, etc.] 'In a voluntary humility,' Auth, ; 'willynge to. teche in mekeness,' Wiel.; ' which after his awne ymaginacion walketh in the humblenes and holynes of angels,' Tynd., sim. Cov.; 'wyllynge in humblynesse,' Cov. (Test.), Rhem.; ' by the humbienes and holynes of angels,' Cianm.; 'by humblenes, and worshipping of angels,' Gen. ; ' in the humb. and w. of angels,' Bish. The insertion of the epithet 'fulse,' is only an exegetical gloss to assist the general reader.
The angels] 'Ancels,' Auth. and all the other $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$. The insertion of the article is perlaps not a certain correction, as it may be used only to specify the genus. It seems however plausible to consider it as referring to the special class to whom this unbecoming adoration was habitually offered.

The things] So Wicl., Cov. (Test.), Cramm., Rhem.: 'those things,' Auth., Bish.; 'thinges,' Tynd., Cou. . The mind of lis flesh ${ }^{\text {I }}$ Sim. Wiel., with wit of his ficisch:' Cov. (Test.), ' in the meanynge of hys flestie:' Rinem., ' by the sense of his flesh :' 'his fleshly mind,' Auth. and the remaining Vv. (Cov., ' his owne').
19. Holding fust] 'Holding,' Wicl., Cov. (Test.), Rheem.; 'holdeth,' Tynd. and the remaining $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{V}}$.

The whole body] So Coverd. (both), Rhem.: ' all the body,' Auth. and the remaining Vr.

By means of its joints]
'By joints,' Auth, and the other Vv. except Coverd. (Test.), 'by knottes and jointes;' Wicl., 'bi boondis and joinynges.' Being linit tugether] 'Knit together,' Author., Genev., Bish.; ' made,' Wicl. ; ' and is knet together,' Tynd., Cov., Cran.; 'fastened together,' Con. (Test.); 'compacted,' Rhem.
20. If ] '*Wherefore if,' Auth.

As if ye were living] 'As though living,' Auth., Bish.; Wicl. (very exactly), 'as men living;' 'as though ye yet lived,' Tynd., Gen. (Cov. omits ' yet. ') Do ye submit] 'Are ye sulject,' Auth. ; 'demen ye,' Wicl. ; 'are ye ledde with tradicions,' Tynd., Cran., Bish.; 'holden with soch trad.,' Coverd. ; 'what do ye yet use decrees,' Coverd. (Test.); 'are ye burthened with traditions,' Gen.; 'decree,' Them. The change in the text is intended to express that $\delta$ oruati $i \in \sigma \hat{\epsilon} \epsilon$ is here taken as in the middle voice.
21. Hundle not, etc.] 'Touch not; taste not; handle not,' Author. and the other Vv. (Tynd. and Genev. prefix 'of them that say') except Wicl., 'that ye touche mot, nether taast, nether trete with hondis the thingis ;' Cov., 'as when they say, touch not this, taste not that, handte not that.'
22. Which things] 'Which,' Auth. Are all] So Rhem., and in a similar collocation Cov. (Test.) : 'all are,' Auth. and the remaining Vv. except Coverd., 'all these things do.' Change made to
doctrines of men? ${ }^{23}$ All which things have indeed the repute of wisdom iu voluntary worship, and lowliness of mind, and unsparing treatinent of the body, not in any thing of real value, serving only to satisfy the flesh.

## CHAPTER III.

If then ye were raised together with Christ, seek the things that are above, where Clurist is, sitting on the right hand of God.
preserve not only the order but a distinction between the definite and the indefinite relative ; see next verse.
To be destroyed, etc.] 'To perish with the using,' Author.; 'in to deeth by the ilke use,' Wicl.;-; 'perysshe with the usyng of them,' Tynd., Gen. ; 'do hurte unto men because of the abuse of them,' Cov., - an unusually incorrect translation, especially for Coverd. ; 'do all hurte with the very use,' Cov. (Test.) ; 'perysshe thorow the very abusc,' Cranm. ; 'be in corruption, in abusynge,' Bish.;' 'unto destruction by the very use,' Rhem.
23. All which thinys] 'Which things,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Wicl., Cov. (Test.), Rhem., 'which.'
The repute] ' $\Lambda$ shew,' Author., Bish., Gen., Rhem. ; 'a resoun,' Wicl.; 'the similitude,' Tynd., Cran.; 'shync,' Cov. (both). The definite article with 'repute' seems required by usage and ordinary English idiom.
Voluntary worship] Similarly Gen., 'volontarie worshipping;' Bish., 'voluntarie religion:' ' will worship,' Autior.; 'veyn relegioun,' Wicl.; 'chosen holynes,' Tynd. ; 'chosen spirituality;' Cov. ; 'supersticion,' Cov. (Test.), Gen., Rhem. Lowliness of mind] 'Humility,' Author. Possibly here the epithet 'false' might be inserted as in ver. 18.
Unsparing treatment] 'Neglecting,' Auth.; 'not to spare,' Wicl., Rhem. ; 'in that they spare not,' Tynd.,. Coverd.; ' in not
sparyng,' Coverd. (Test.), Genev., Bish. Not in any thing, etc.] Somewhat similarly Gen., ' yet are of no value;' 'in any honor,' Auth., Wicl., Bish., Rhem.; 'do the flesshe no worshype,' Tynd., Coverd., Cran.; ' counting it not worthy of ony honoure,' Cor. (Test.). It will be observed (see below) that Gen. approaches most nearly to the view taken in the text, but that it tacitly assumes a change of construction and an ellipsis of the verb substantive. To avoid this, and to be intelligible, we seem forced to some paraphrase like that in the text.
Serving only, etc.] 'To the satisfying of,' Author., and sim. the other VV. except Gen., which thus paraphrases, 'but apperteine to those things wherwith the fleshe is crammed.'

Cuapter III. 1. If then] 'If ye then,' Author. and the other Vv. except Wicl., Rhem., 'therfor if ye;' Cov. (Test.), 'yf ye are therfore.' W'ere raised together] 'Be risen,' Auth., Bish., Rhem. ; 'han rise to gidre,' Wicl.; 'be then rysen agayne,' Tynd., Cranm.; 'be risen now with,' Cocerd. ; 'are therfore rysen with,' Coverd. (Test.); 'be rysen agayne with,' Gen.

The things that are abore] So Cov. (Test.), Rhem.: ' those things which are,' Auth. and the remaining Vv. except Wicl., 'the thingis that ben.' The lighter relative 'that' seems here more suitable, and
${ }^{2}$ Set your minds on the things that are above, not on the things that are on the earth. ${ }^{3}$ For ye died, and your life hath been hidden with Christ in God. ${ }^{4}$ When Clurist, our Life, shall be manifested, then shall ye also be manifested with Iim in glory.
${ }^{5}$ Make dead then your members which are upon the earth ; fornication, uncleanness, lustfulness, evil concupiscence, and covetousness, the which is idolatry : ${ }^{6}$ for which things' sake the wrath of God doth come on the children of disobedience ; ${ }^{7}$ anong whom ye also once walked, when ye were living in these sins. ${ }^{8}$ But
accords with the translation in verse 2. On the supposed distinction between 'that' and 'which,' compare notes on Eph. i. 23 (Transl.), and Brown, Gram. of Grammars, 11. 5, p. 293 (ed. 1). Perhaps, as a very rough rule, it may be said that ' which' is a little more appropriately used when the clause introduced by the relative tends to form a distinct and separable predication in reference to the antecedent; ' that,' when the relative so coalesces with its concomitants as either to form with them a species of epithet, or to express a predominant and prevailing, rather than an accidental characteristic.

Christ is, sitting] So Cov.: 'sitteth,' Auth., Tynd., Cran., Gen., Bish.; 'is sitting at,' Wicl., Cov. (Test.), Rhem.
2. Set your minds] So Cov. (Test.), and Cov. ('minde') : 'set your affection,' Auth. and the remaining Vv. except Wicl., 'sauer tho thingis;' Bish., 'affections' (plural).
The things that are (bis)] So Rhem.: 'things ' (bis), Auth., Bish.; 'tho thingis that ben aboue not tho that ben, etc.,' Wicl., Coverd. (Test.) ; 'thynges that are above, and not on thinges which are,' Tynd., Cor. (inverts relatives), Cranm., Gen. ('which,' bis).
3. Died] 'Are dead,' Author. and all Vv.; see notes.

Hath been]
' Is,' Auth.
4. Christ, our Life] So Cov.: Author. inserts 'who is;' Tynd., Cranm., Gen.,

Bish. insert 'which is ; Wicl., Coverd. (Test.), IRhem., 'yoare liif.'
Be manifisted (bis)] 'Appear' (bis), Auth.; Wicl., Cov. (Test.), Bish., Rhem.; 'shewe him silfe - appeare,' Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen. The change seems necessary to keep up the antithesis between

5. Make dead then] 'Mortify thercfore,' Author. and the other Vv. except Wicl., 'therfor sle ye.'

Which] So
Auth. and the other Vv. except Coverd. (Test.), Rhem., 'that,' and Cran., 'erthy membres.' Here 'that' seems inexact ; the original is $\tau \grave{\alpha} \mu^{\prime} \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \eta \dot{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \grave{\alpha}$ è $\pi l \tau \eta$ ท̂s रîs. Lustfulness] Similarly Rhem., 'lust:' 'inordinate affection,' Auth., Bish. ; 'Ieccherie,' Wicl.; 'unnaturall lust,' Tynd., Cov. (both), Cran.; 'wantonness,' Gen. The which] 'Which,' Auth. and all the other Vv.
6. Doth come] So Coverd. (Test.), and somewhat similarly Cranmer, 'useth to come:' ' cometh,' Author., Tynd., Cov., Gen., Bish., Rhem.; 'cam,' Wicl.
7. Among whom] So Cran.: 'in the which,' Auth., Cov. (both), Gen., Bish.; 'in whiche,' Wicl., Rhem.; 'in which thynges,' Tynd. Once] 'Sometime,' Auth. Were living] 'Lived,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Cov. (Test.), 'did live.'
These sins] '*Them,' Auth.
8. Do ye] 'Ye also,' Auth.; the other Vv. adopt the simple imperative form, ' put ye, etc.,' but thereby somewhat ob.

Now do ye also put away from you all these ; anger, wrath, malice, railing, coarse speaking out of your mouth; ${ }^{9}$ do not lie one to another, sceing that ye have put off from you the old man with his deeds; ${ }^{10}$ and have put on the new man, which is being renewed unto knowledlge after the image of Him that created him: ${ }^{11}$ where there is no Greek and Jew, circumcision and uncircuncision, Barbarian, Scythian, bond-man, free-man ; but Chirist is all, and in all.
${ }^{12}$ Put ye on, then, as elect of God, holy and beloved, bowels of mercy, kindness, lowliness of mind, meekness, long-suffering ; ${ }^{13}$ forbearing one another, and forgiving each other, if any man
scure the connection of kal with $\dot{v} \mu \in i \hat{s}$. Put away from you] So, in slightly varied order, Tynd., Cov., Cianm. ; Wicl., (ien., and Bish. omit 'from you:' 'put off,' Auth.; 'lay away,' Coverd. (Test.), Them. It seems desirable to preserve a



All
these] So Auth., and sim. most of the other Vv. Bish. omits 'these,' but is thus very liable to be misunderstood, especially as some cdd. leave out the comma that ought to separate 'all' and the subst. that follows.
Railing] 'Blasphemy,' Author., Wicl., Coverd. (Test.), Bish., Rhem.; 'cursed speaking,' Tynd., Coverd., Cran., Gen. C'oarse spealing] 'Filthy communication,' Auth., Cov. (Test.), Cran., Bish. ; ' foule word,' Wicl. ; 'filthy speakynge,' Tynd., Gen.; filthy wordes,' Cov.; 'filthie talke,' Rhem.
9. Do not lie] 'Lic not,' Author, and the other Vv. except Wicl., 'nyle ye lie.' Off from you] Auth. omits 'from you,' and similarly the other Vv. except Wicl., 'spuyle ye you;' Cov. (Test.), 'robbyng yourselves ;' Rhem., spoiling yourselves of.'
10. Unto] So Rhem., and similarly Wicl., Cran., Bish., 'in to : ' 'in,' Auth. and the remaining V v .
Is being renewed] 'Is renewed,' Auth.
11. There is no] 'There is neither,' Auth. And (bis)] So Wicl., Coverd. (Test.), Rhem.: 'nor,' Author. and the remaining Vv. exeept Coverd.; which omits.

Bond-man,
free-man] Similarly Wicl., 'bondo man and freman :' 'bond nor free,' Author.; 'or,' Tynd., Cran. ; 'and,' Cov. (Test.), Rhem.; Coverd., Gen., Bish. omit 'nor.'
12. Put ye] So Cov. (Test.), Rhem., and similarly Wicl.: Author, and the remaining Vv . omit. The insertion of the pronoun is perhaps desirable at the beginning of a new paragraph.
Then] 'Therefore,' Auth. and all the other Vr. Elect] So Tynd., Cov. (Test.), Cranm., Gen.: 'the elect,' Auth., Cov., Bish., Rhem.; 'the chosun,' Wicl. Perhaps a morc exact translation would be 'chosen ones,' as giving to ${ }^{\dot{e}} \kappa \boldsymbol{\lambda} \boldsymbol{\lambda} \kappa$ кol its substantival force without the inaccuracy of the inserted article.
Mercy] '*Mercies,' Auth.
Lowliness of mind] So Auth. in Pliil. ii. 3: 'humbleness of mind,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Wicl., 'mekenes ; ' Cov. (Test.), 'lowlinesse;.' Rhem., 'humilitie.'
13. Each other] Similarly Wicl., Cov. (Test.), both of which make a difference of translation between $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \dot{\eta} \lambda \omega \nu$ and $\dot{\varepsilon} \alpha v-$ rois ('ech oon other - you silf,' '. eche other - amonge yourselves ') ; see notes.

Luve a complaint against any ; as Christ forgave you, even so doing also jourselves. ${ }^{14}$ But over all these put on Love, which is the bond of perfectness. ${ }^{15}$ And let the peace of Christ rule in your hearts, to the which ye were also called in one body; and be ye thankful. ${ }^{16}$ Let the word of Christ dwell within you richly, teachingr and admonishing one another in all wisdom, with psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs, in Grace singing in your hearts to God. ${ }^{17}$ And in every thing, whatsoever ye do in word or deed, do all in the name of Jesus Christ, giving thanks to God the Father through Him.

18 Wives, submit yourselves unto your husbands, as it should be

Auth. and the remaining $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v} . \text {., ' one an- }}$ other.! Complaint] So Cov.
(Test.): 'quarrel,' Author, and all the remaining $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$.
$A s]$ ' Even as,' Auth. In the attempt to express the true participial structure, idiom seems to require the union of 'even' with the latter member; compare Tynd., Cran., Gen., Bish.

Even so,
etc.] 'So also do ye,' Auth., Bish.; ' so also ye,' Wicl.; ' even so do ye,' Tynd., Cran., Gen.; 'so do ye also,' Coverd. (both) ; ' so you also,' Rhem.
14. But $]$ So Coverd., Rhem.: 'and,' Auth., Wicl., Cov. (Test.), Gen., Bish.; Tynd., Cran. omit. Over] So, with apparently similar local force, Wicl., ' upon:' ' above,' Auth. and the remaining Vv., some of which, as Cov. (both), 'above all things,' probably here gave to $\bar{\epsilon} \pi \$ a decided ethical reference.
These] Auth. adds 'things,'. and so the other $V \mathrm{v}$. Perhaps the indeterminate 'these,' 'i.e. 'qualities,' 'principles,', 'virtues,' is more exact. Love] So Tynd., Coverd. (both), Cran., Gen.: ' charity,' Author., Wicl., Bish., Rhem. See notes on 1 Tim. i. 5 (Transl.).
15. Christ] '*God,' Auth.

Were] 'Are,' Auth. and all the other Vv. Also called]' Sim. Coverd., ' called also:' Auth. (' which also') and Rhem. ('wherein also') connect with the pronoun.
16. Within] 'In,' Author. and all the other $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$. In all wisdom] Auth. and all the other $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{r}}$. place these words after, and connect them with the adverb. With] So Cov., Rhem.: 'in,' Auth. and the remaining Vv. Hymns] Auth. prefixes '**and ;' so also before 'spiritual songs,' but with not much critical probability.
In grace] So Wicl., Rhem.: ' with grace,' Auth., Cran., Bish. The change seems desirable to obviate such misunderstandings as Tynd., Coverd., 'songes which have favour with them;' Cov. (Test.), 'graciously;' Gen., 'with a certeyn grace.' Singing in your hearts]
So Wicl., Rhem.: 'singing with grace in,' Author., and similarly the remaining $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$. It seems especially desirable here to preserve the order of the Greek, as $\ddot{\alpha} \delta \epsilon \epsilon \nu$ ! $\nu$ тaîs Kapo. stands in distinct contrast with another and audible singing.
17. And in every thing, whatsoever] 'And whatsoever,' Author. It seems right to preserve the slight irregularity of the original as setting forth the studied inclusiveness of the command.
Jesus Christ] '*Lord Jesus,' Auth. G'od the Father] ' God *and the Father,' Auth. :Through] 'By,' Auth. and all the other $\cdot \mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$.
18. Your husbands] 'Your *own hus.
in the Lord. ${ }^{19}$ Husbands, love your wives, and le not embittered towards them. ${ }^{20}$ Children, obey your parents in all things; for this is well-pleasing in the Lord. ${ }^{21}$ Fathers, provoke not your cliildren, lest they be disheartened. ${ }^{22}$ Bond-servants, obey in all things your masters according to the flesh; not with acts of eyeservice, as men-pleasers, but in singleness of heart, fearing the Lord. ${ }^{23}$ Whatever ye do, do $i t$ from the heart, as to the Lord and not to men; ${ }^{24}$ seeing ye know that of the Lord ye shall receive the recompense of the inheritance. Serve ye the Lord Christ; ${ }^{25}$ for the wrong-doer shall receive back that which he did wrongfully; and there is no respect of persons.

## CHAPTER IV.

Masters, deal out unto your servants justice and equity ; seeing ye know that ye also have a Master in heaven.
bands,' Auth. ' It is fit,' Auth.; 'it bihoucth,' Wicl., Phem.; 'it is comly,' Tynd., Coverd., Cran., Gen., Bish. ; 'it is duc,' Coverd. (Test.).
19. Embittered] 'Bitter,' Auth.

Towards] So Coverd. (Test.), Rhem.; ' against,' Author., Bish. ; ' to,' Wicl.; ' unto,' Tynd. and the remaining $\nabla \mathrm{v}$.
20. In the Lord] '*Unto the Lord,' Auth.
21. Provoke] Auth., Coverd. (Test.), Ciran., Gen., Bish. add 'to anger' after 'children.' This scems unnecessary : as in present practice 'provoke,' when used absolutely, nearly always involves the notion of 'anger' or 'indignation.'
Disheartened] 'Discouraged,' Author., Bish., Rhem. ; 'be not made febil herted,' Wicl. ; 'be of a desperate mynde,' Tynd., Cov., Cranm.; 'ware not feble mynded,' Coverd. (Test.) ; 'cast downe their harte,' Gen.
22. Bond-servants] 'Servants,' Auth., Wicl., Tynd., Gen., Bish., Rhem. ; ' ye servants,' Cov. (both), Cran.
Acts 'of eyeservice] 'Eyeservice,' Auth.
and the other Vv. except Wicl., 'seriynge of the iye;' Cov. (Test.), Rhem. (' to the').

The Lord]
'洪God,' Auth.
23. Whatever] '*And whatsoever,' Author. From the heart]. So Rhem.: ' heartily,' Auth. and the remaining $V$ v. except Wicl., ' of wille.'
To men] 'Unto men,' Auth.
24. Seeing ye know] Similarly Tynd., 'for as moche as yc knowe: ' 'knowing,'
Auth., Con. (Test.), Gen., Bish., Rhem.; 'vittynge,' Wicl.; 'and ye be sure,' Cov., Cran. (omits 'ye').
Recompense] 'Reward,' Author. and the other Vv. except Wicl., 'gildynge ' [giving] ; Rhem., 'retribution.'
Serve $y e]$ '*For ye serve,' Auth.
25. For] '*But,' Auth.

The wrong-doer] 'He that doeth wrong,' Auth., Tynd., Cov., Gen., Bish. ; 'he that doeth injuric,' Wicl., Rhem.; 'whoso doth wronge, Coverd. (Test.) ; ' he that doth sinne,' Cran. Receive back] Sim. Wicl.; Cov. (Test.); Rhemı, 'resceyue that, etc. :' 'receive for the wrong which he hath done;' Auth.
${ }^{2}$ Persevere in your prayer, being watchful therein with thanksgiving ; ${ }^{3}$ withal praying also for us, that God would open unto us a door of the word, to speak the mystery of Christ, for the sake of which I am also in bonils, ${ }^{4}$ in order that I may make it manifest, as I ought to speak. ${ }^{5}$ Walk in wisdom toward them which are without, buying up the time. ${ }^{6}$ Let your speech be alway with grace, seasoned with salt, so that ye may know how ye ought to answer every man.
${ }^{7}$ All my state shall Tychicus declare unto you, our beloved brother, and faithful minister, and fellow-servant in the Lord: ${ }^{8}$ whom I have sent unto you for this very purpose, that he may

Cimapter IV. 1. Deal out] 'Give,' Auth., Wicl., Cov. (Test.) ; ‘do,’ Tynd. and the remaining $\mathrm{Vv}_{\mathrm{v}}$.
Justice and equity] 'That which is just and equal,' Auth. and all the other Vv. ( Cov. Test. omits 'which') except Wicl., ' that that is just and euene.'
Seeing ye know] So Tynd.: 'knowing,' Auth., Gen., Bish., Rhem.; 'vitynge,' Wicl.; 'and knowe,' Coverd.; 'beynge sure,' Cov. (Test.) ; 'and be sure,' Cran.
2. Persevere in $]$ 'Continue in,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Wicl., ' be ye bisie in ;' Rhem., 'be instant.'
Your prayer] 'In prayer,' Author. and all the other Vv .

Being
watchful] Sim. Coverd. (Test.), Rhem., 'watching:' 'and watch,' Author, and the remaining $\mathrm{Vv}_{\mathrm{v}}$. except Wicl., 'and wake.' Therein] So Coverd. (Test.) : 'in the same,' Auth, and the remaining Vv. except Wicl., Rhem., 'in it.'
3. Of the word] So Cov. (both), and sim. Wicl., ' of word:' 'of utterance,' Author. and the remaining $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$. except Rhem., ' of speech.' For the sake of which] 'For which,' Auth., Wicl.; 'wherfore,' Tynd., Cov., Cranm., Gen., Bish.; 'for the whyche thynge,' Coverd. (Test.) ; 'for the which,' Rhem.
4. In order that] 'That,' Author. and all the other Vv .
5. Buying up] 'Redeeming,' Auth., Coverd. (Test.), Bish., Rhem.; ;' agenbiynge,' Wicl. ; 'and redeme,' Tynd., Cov., Cranm., Genev. ; 'lose no opportunite,' Cran.
6. So that] 'That,' Auth. and all the other Vv. The slight change is made to express distinctly the infin. of consequence, and to prevent 'that' being regarded as indicative of purpose, and as a translation of ${ }^{2} \nu a$ with the subjunctive.
7. Our beloved] So Gen., and similarly Rhemish, 'our dearest:' 'a beloved,' Author.; 'moost dere' (no art.), Wicl.; 'the deare,' Tynd., Cov.; ' the monste deare,' Coverd. (Test) ; 'the beloved,' Cranm. ; 'a dearely beloued,' Bish.
Faithful] So Wicl., Cov. (both), Cran., Bish., Rhem. ; 'a faithful,' Auth., Tynd., Gen.
8. Have sent] So Auth. and the other Vv. except Wicl., Cov. (Test.), 'sent.' As Tychicus appears certainly to have been the bearer of this letter (compare notes on Phil. ii. 28, and on Philem. 2), the pres. 'send' was adopted in ed. 1. Our English perfect, however, seems to be used idiomatically with a similar epistolary reference to present time, and may thus be left unchanged.
This very] 'The same,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Wicl., Rhem., 'this same;' Cov. (Test.), 'therfore.'
know your estate, and comfort your hearts; ${ }^{9}$ with Onesimus our faithful and beloved brother, who is one of you. They shall make known unto you all things which are done here.
${ }^{10}$ Aristarchus my fellow-prisoner saluteth you, and Mark, the cousin of Barnabas, touching whom ye received commandments (if he come unto you receive him) ; ${ }^{11}$ and Jesus, which is called Justus, who are of the circumcision. These only are my fellow-workers unto the kingdom of God, men who have proved a comfort unto me. ${ }^{12}$ Epaphras, who is one of you, a servant of Christ Jesus, saluteth you, always striving earnestly for you in his prayers, that ye may stand fast, perfect and fully assured in all the will of God. ${ }^{13}$ For I bear him witness, that he hath much labor for you, and them that

May] ' Might,' Author. Change to preserve the 'succession' of tenses.
9. Our fuithful] Sim. Cov. (Test.), 'our mooste beloued and faythful:' 'a faithful,' Auth. and the remaining Vv. except Wicl., moost dere and feithful;' Rhem., 'the most dere and faithful.'
Which are done] So Author., except that in the more approved editions 'are,' which is necessary for the construction, is in italics, while 'done,' which is a mere exegetical insertion, is in the ordinary character. A better, but now antiquated, translation is that of Tynd., al., ' which are adoynge here.'
10. Mark] So Wicl., Coverd. (Test)., Rhem. : 'Marcus,' Auth. and the remaining $\mathrm{V}_{\mathbf{V}}$; see notes on ch. i. 1.
The cousin of] So Wicl., and sim. Rhem., ' the cosin-german of:' 'sister's son to Barnabas,' Auth. and sim. Tynd. ('Barnabassis systers sonne') and the other Vv. It seems very doubtful whether this is to be considered a mistake : it is not improbably an archaic mode of expression, equivalent to the 'Geschwisterkind,' of the German. The following words are included by Auth. in a parenthesis : this seems hardly correct; see notes.
11. Men who have proved] 'Which have been,' Auth., Cranm., Bish., Rhem.;
' that when,' Wicl. ; 'which were,' Tynd., Cov., Gen.; 'which comforted,' Coverd. (Test.).
12. Christ Jesus] '*Christ,' Auth. Striving earnestly] Sim. Marg., 'striving:' 'laboring fervently,' Auth., Bish., and sim. Tynd., Cov., Chanm., Gen., 'laboreth fervently;' 'bisie for you,' Wicl.; 'alwaye carefull,' Cov. (Test.), Rhem. His prayers] Auth. omits 'his.' Stand fast] 'Stand,' Author. and all the other Vv. The addition of the epithet is useful as implying what really seems involved in the $\sigma \tau \eta ิ \tau \epsilon$, and as also leaving the secondary predicates $\tau \epsilon \in \lambda \epsilon 10 \ell$ and $\pi \epsilon \pi \lambda \eta \rho \circ \phi$. more independent and emphatic. Fully assured] '*Complete,' Auth.
13. Witness] Sim. Wicl., 'witnessynge: ' 'record,' Auth. and the remaining Vv. except Rhem., 'testimonie.' Much labor] '*A great zeal,' Auth.
Them that are] So Auth., Cov. (Test.) ; the other Vv. vary: Wicl. inserts 'that ben' in both clauses ; 'them of L. and them of H.,' Tynd., Gen., Bish.; 'them at L. and at H.,' Coverd. ; 'that are of' (in both clauses), Cranm.; 'that are in' (in both clauses), Bish. ; 'that be at L., and that are at H.,' Rhem. In this variety the translation of Cor. (Test.)
are in Laodicea, and them in Hierapolis. ${ }^{14}$ Luke, the beloved physician, saluteth you, and Demas. ${ }^{15}$ Salute the brethren that are in Laodicea, and Nymphas, and the church which is in his house. ${ }^{16}$ And when this epistle is read among you, cause that it be read also in the church of the Laodiceans; and that ye likewise read the epistle from Laodicea. ${ }^{17}$ And say to Archippus, Take heed to the ministry which thou receivedst in the Lord, that thou fulfil it.
${ }^{18}$ The salutation by the hand of me Paul. Remember my bonds. Grace be with you.
factory ; the insertion 'that are,' in the first clause, makes the meaning perfectly clear, while its omission, in the second, prevents the sentence being unduly heavy.
14. Saluteth you] So Coverd. (Test.), Rhem., and, in the same order, Tynd., Cov., Cranm., Gen., 'greteth:' 'greet you' (at the end of the verse), Author., Wicl., Bish.
15. That are] So Wicl., Cov. (Test.), Rhem. : 'which are,' Auth. and the other Vv. Change to preserve a uniform translation with ver. 13.
17. Receivedst] 'Hast received,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Wicl., 'hast takun.'
18. With you] Auth. adds '*Amen.'

## TIIE EPISTLE TO PIIILEMON.

PAUL, a prisoner of Christ Jesus, and Timothy our brother, unto Plilemon our dearly beloved and fellow-laborer, ${ }^{2}$ and to Apphia our sister and to Archippus our fellow-soldier, and to the church in thy house : ${ }^{3}$ grace be unto you, and peace, from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ. ${ }^{4}$ I thank my God, always making mention of thee in my prayers, ${ }^{5}$ hearing, as I do, of thy love and the faith, which thou hast toward the Lord, and dost show toward all the saints ; ${ }^{6}$ that the communication of thy faith may become effectual unto Christ Jesus in the knowledge of every good

1. Beloved and] 'Beloved, and etc.,' Auth. The comma should be removed, as $\grave{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ apparently belongs both to $\alpha$ àa$\pi \eta \tau \hat{\varphi}$ and $\sigma v \nu \epsilon \rho \gamma \bar{\varphi}$.
2. Our sister] '*Our beloved Apphia,' Auth. To Arch.] So all the Vv. except Author. and Coverd. (Test.), which omit the 'to.'
3. Grace be unto you] 'Grace to you,' Auth. The insertion of 'be' with 'to' or 'unto' is the form adopted by Auth. elsewhere in St. Paul's Epistles.
4. Always making mention] So, in point of order, Rhem. The other Vv. differ in their mode of placing the adverb: Author. places it after ' of thee;' Wicl. connects it with the foregoing clause; Tynd. and the remaining Vv. insert it directly after 'mention.' It seems best to follow the order of the Greck, and so to retain the slight emphasis which the position implies.
5. Hearing, as I do] 'Hearing,' Auth.,

Wicl., Coverd. (Test.), Bish., Rhem.; 'when I heare,' Tynd., Cranm., Gen.; 'for so moch as I heare,' Coverd. The participle explains the circumstances which led to the prayer boing offered. The fuith] So Coverd. (Test.) : 'faith,' Auth. and the remaining Vv. Lord] 'Lord 粦Jesus,' Auth.
Dost show toward] 'And toward,' Auth. and the other $\mathrm{Vv}_{\mathrm{v}}$. except Wicl., ' and to ;' Cov. (Test.), ' and unto.'
The saints] So Rhem.: 'saints,' Author. and the remaining $V v$. except Wicl., 'holi men.'
6. Unto Christ Jesus] 'In Chr. Jesus,' Author., Wicl., Coverd. (Test.), Rhem., and at the end of the verse. So, in point of order, Tynd., 'by Jesus Christ;' Cranm., Bish., 'towarde J. C.;' 'the good that ye have in J. C.,' Cov.; Gen., with a transposed order, 'whatsouer good thing is in you throughe Christ may be knowen.'
thing which is in us. 7 For I had much joy and consolation in thy love, becanse the hearts of the saints have been refreshed by thee, brother.

8 Wherefore, though I have much boldness in Christ to enjoin thee that which is becoming, ${ }^{9}$ yet for love's sake I rather beseech thee. Being such an one as Paul the aged, and now also a prisoner of Jesus Christ, ${ }^{10}$ I beseech thee for my orm child Onesimus, whom I begat in my bonds; ${ }^{11}$ which in time past was to thee unprofitable, but now profitable to thee and to me; ${ }^{12}$ whom I have sent back to thee. But do thou receive him, that. is, mine own bowels; ${ }^{13}$ whom I was purposing to retain with myself, that in thy stead he might minister unto me in the bonds of the gospel: ${ }^{14}$ but without thine approval would I do nothing, that the grood thou

In the linouledye] Sim. Wicl., 'in knowinge;' Coverd. (Test.), Cran:n., Bish., 'in the knowledge ;' Rhem., ' in the agnition of:' ' by the acknowledging of,' Auth.; 'thorow knowledge,' Tynd., Cor., Genev. changes the construction ; sce ạbove. $\left.U_{s}\right]$ ‘*You,' Auth.
7. I had] '*We have,' Auth.

Much] 'Great,' Luth. Hearts] So Tynd.,' Cran., Gen.: 'bowels,' Auth., Bishu, Phem.; ' entrailis,' Wicl., Cov. (Test.) ; ' are hertely refreszlied,' Cov.
Have been] 'Are,' Auth. and the other: Vv. except Wicl., 'restiden;' Coverd. (Test.), 'dyd reste ;' Rhiem., 'hame rested.'
8. Have much boldness] Sim. Wich, 'hauyng myche trist;' Rhem., 'hauing great confidence:' ' might be bold,' Auth., Cranm. ; ' be bold,' Tynd., Gen.; 'have great boldnes,' Cov.; 'I begnge bold,' Cov. (Test.) ; ' be much bolde,' Bish. Enjoin thiee] So Authh, following Tynd. and Gen.; an archaism which it does not seem necessary to remove.
Becoming] Sim. Tynd., Cov., Gien., 'that which becometh the:' 'convenient,' Auth., Bish.; 'that that perteyneth to profete,' Wicl.; 'that maketh matter,' Coverd. (Test.); 'that which was thy deivtye to do,' Cranmer; ' that which
perteyneth to the purpose,' Rhem.
9. Thiec] Auth. places a comma after 'thice,' and a full stop at tho end of the verse; so very similarly all the other $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v} \text {. : Wicl. ('sithen thou art suche as, }}$ etc.') and Rhiem. ('whereas thon art such an one, etc.') refer the roooviros केv to Philemon.
10. Own child] 'Son,' Auth. and all the other $V_{v}$.

Begat] So Wicl., Tynd., Gen.: 'have begotten,' Auth. and the remaining Vv.
12. Have sent] So Auth, and the other Vv. except Wicl, Coverd., 'sente:' see notes on Col. iv. 8 (Transl.).
Back to thee] Author: omits '*to thee.' But do, etc.] 'Thou therefore,' Auth.
13. Was purposing to retain] 'Would have retained,' Auth., Rhem.; 'woold with hoold,' Wicl, ' 'wolde fayne have retayned,' Tynd., Cran., Gen.; 'wolde haue kepte,' Cov. (both); 'would have fayne reta yned,' Bish.
Myself] ' Me ,' Auth. and all the other Vv. Might minister] So Rhem. ; 'might have ministered,' Auth. and the remaining $V_{v}$. except Wicl., 'schulde serve.'
14. Thine approval] 'Thy mind,' $A u$ thor. and the other Vv . except Wicl., Cov. (Test.), Rhem., 'counceil.'
doest should not be as it were of necessity, but willingly. ${ }^{15}$ For perhaps he therefore departed for a season, that thou mightest receive him eternally; ${ }^{16}$ no longer as a servant, but above a servant, a brother beloved, specially to me, but how much more unto thee, both in the flesh, and in the Lord? ${ }^{17}$ If therefore thou countest me a partner, reccive him as myself. ${ }^{18}$ But if he hath wronged thee, or oweth thee ought, this set down to my account; ${ }^{19}$ I Paul have written with mine own hand, I will repay it : that I may not say to thee how thou owest unto me even thine own self besides. ${ }^{20}$ Yea, brother, may I reap profit from thee in the Lord: refresh my heart in Christ.

The good thou doest] Sim. Cov. (both: Cov. Test., 'that thou, etc.'), Cranm., ' the good whiche thou doest ;' Tynd., 'that good which springeth of the:' 'thy benefit,'. Auth., Gen., Bish.; 'thy good,' Wicl., Rhem.
15. Therefore] So Auth. and all the other. Vv.; and apparently with good reason, for the more usual translation, 'for this cause,' seems to fail in connecting the first and second members with sufficient closeness, unless emphasis is laid on 'this.'

Mightest] So
Cov. (Test.), Rhem.: 'shouldest,' Auth. and the remaining Vv .
Eternally] 'For ever,' Author. and the other Vv. except Wiclif', 'withouten ende.'
16. No longer] 'Not now,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Wicl., Rhem., 'now not.'
17. If therefore] So Gen., Rhem., and sim. Wicl., 'therfor if :' Auth., Cranm., Cov. (Test.), Bish., 'if thou count me therefore ; ' Cov. omits. As oưv has apparently here somewhat of an inferential tinge (see notes on Phil. ii. 28), the translation ' therefore ' may be retained, and be allowed here to occupy the same position in the sentence as o $\delta \nu$ in the Greek.

Countest] So Gen., and similarly as to mood, Wicl., 'hast;' Cov. (Test.), 'holdest:' 'count,' Auth.,

Tynd., Cran., Bish.; 'holdo me for,' Coverd. ; 'tako me for,' Rhem. On the proper use of the indicative and subjunctive with 'if,' see Latham, Engl. Lang. § 614 (ed. 3), and notes on 2 Thess. iii. 14 (Trunsl.).
18. But if] So Coverd. (both) : 'if,' Author. and the remaining $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{r}}$. except Wicl., 'for if;' Rhem., ' and if.'
Hath uronged] So Autho, and in respect of the insertion of the 'hath' all the other Vv. This therefore may be regarded as one of those cases in which our idiom requires the auxiliary to be inserted. If omitted, the event seems too far removed back into the past : compare 1 Thess. ii. 16 (Transl.).
This set down, etc.] ' *Put that down on mine account,' Author.; 'arrette thou this thing to me,' Wicl.; 'that laye to my charge,' Tynd., Cov. (Cov. Test., 'lay that '), Cranm., Gen., Bish.; 'that impute to me,' Rhem. It will be observed that six out of the nine Vr. retain the emphatic position of the pronoun.
19. Written] So Rhem.: ' written it,' Author. and the remaining $\mathrm{Vv}_{\mathrm{v}}$ except Wicl., 'wroot;' Genev., Bish., 'written this.' That I may not say] Very sim. Wicl., 'that I seie not:' 'albeit, I do not say,' Author., Gen., Bish.; 'so that I do not saye,' Tynd., Coverd.
${ }^{21}$ Having confidenco in thy obedience I have written unto thee, knowing that thou wilt do even above what I say. ${ }^{22}$ Moreover at the same time prepare me also a lodging: for I hope that through your prayers I shall be granted unto you.
${ }^{23}$ Epaphras, my fellow-prisoner in Christ Jesus, saluteth thee : ${ }^{2 t}$ Marcus, Aristarchus, Demas, Lucas, my fellow-laborers. ${ }^{25}$ The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with your spirit.
(both), Cranmer; ' not to say,' Rhem. 20. Muy I reap profit from] 'Let me have joy of,' Auth.; 'I schal use thee,'
Wicl. ; 'let me enjoye the,' Tynd., Cov., Cian., Bish.; 'thus shall I enjoye thee,' Cov. (Test.) ; 'let me obteyne this fruit,' Gen.; 'graunt I may enjoy thee,' Rhem. Hearl] So Cov.: 'bowels,' Author. and the other Vr. except Wicl., Coin. (Test.), 'entrailis.' Christ] '*The Lord,' Auth. 21. Have written] So Coverd. (both), Rhem. ; 'wrote,' Auth. and the remaining Vv. Do even] 'Also do,' Auth., Cranm., Bish.; 'aboue that also,' Rhem. ; the rest omit кal in translation. Above what $]$ Sim. Coverd. (Test.), "above it that;' Rhem.,
'above that also which:' 'more than,' Auth. and the remaining Vv. except Wicl., 'ouer that that I see.'
22. Moreover at the same time] Sim. Tynd., Cov., Cranin., Gen., 'morcover prepare:' 'but withal,' Author.; ' also make thou redi,' Wicl. ; 'and make redy also,' Cov. (Test.); 'moreover prep. me also,' Bish.; ' and withal,' Rhem.
Granted] 'Given,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Cov. (Test.), 'restored.'
23. Saluteth] Sim. as to number and position Wicl., 'gretith;' Cov. (Test.), 'saluteth the in Christ Jesus :' 'there salute thee,' Auth. and the remaining Vv. except Cov., 'saluteth.'
24. Spirit] Auth. adds '*Amen.'
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## PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION.

The following Commentary is substantially the same, both in principles and execution, as those on the Galatians and Ephesians. I have, however, earnestly striven, on the one hand, to introduce improvements, and, on the other, to amend defects of which time, experience, and, above all, the kind criticism of friends have not failed to convince me.
I will briefly notice both.
In the first place the reader will find the substance of the grammatical references more fully stated in the notes, while at the same time care has been taken to modify and repress the use of technical terms, as far as is consistent with the nature of the Commentary. I confess I cannot yet persuade myself that the use of technical terms in grammar, independently of subserving to brevity, does not also tend to accuracy and perspicuity; still so many objections have been urged by judicious advisers, that I have not failed to give them my most respectful attention. This modification, however, has been introduced with great caution; for the exclusion of all technical terms would not only be wholly inconsistent with the lex operis, but would be certain to lead the way to a rambling inexactitude, which in grammar, as in all other sciences, can never be too scrupulously avoided.

I have also endeavored, as far as possible, to embody in the notes the sentiments and opinions of the dogmatical writers, more especially those of the great English Divines to whom I have been able to refer. Yet here again this has been subordinated to the peculiar nature of the Commentary, which, to be true to its title, must mainly occupy itself with what is critical and grammatical, and must in other subjects confine itself to references and allusions. Still, as in the preface to the Ephesians, so here again, let me earnestly entreat my less mature readers not to regard as the mere bibliographical embroidery of a dull page the references to our English Divines.

They have all been collected with much care ; they are nearly in every case the aggregations of honest individual labor, and if they prove to the student half as beneficial and instructive as they have been to the collector, they will not have been adduced in vain. Let us never forget that there is such a thing as the analogy of Scripture; that it is one thing generally to unfold the meaning of an individual passage, and another to do so consistently with the general principles and teaching of Scripture. The first may often be done with plausible success by means of acuteness, observation, and happy intuitions; the second, independently of higher aids, is only compatible with some knowledge of dogmatical theology, and some acquaintance with those masterpieces of sacred learning which were the glory of the seventeenth century. On verifying these references, the allusion to the individual passage of Scripture will, perhaps, sometimes be found brief and transient, but there will ever be found in the treatise itself, in the mode that the subject is handled, in the learning with which it is adorned, theology of the noblest development, and, not unfrequently, spiritual discernment of the very highest strain.

With many deductions, the same observations may in part apply to the dogmatical treatises of foreign writers referred to in the notes. Several recent works on Christian doctrine, as enunciated by the sacred writers, whether regarded individually or collectively, appear to deserve both recognition and consideration. I would here specify the dogmatical works of Ebrard and Martensen, the Pflanzung und Leitung of Neander, and the Théologie Chrétienne of Reuss, a work of no mean character or pretensions. By the aid of these references, I do venture to think that the student may acquire vast stores both of historical and dogmatical theology, and I dwell especially upon this portion of the Commentary, lest the necessarily frigid tone of the critical or grammatical discussions should lead any one to think that I am indifferent to what is infinitely higher and nobler. To expound the life-giving Word coldly and bleakly, without supplying some hints of its eternal consolations, without pointing to some of its transcendent perfections, its inviolable truths, and its inscrutable mysteries, - thus to wander with closed eyes through the paradise of God, is to forget the expositor's highest duty, and to leave undone the noblest and most sanctifying work to which human learning could presume to address itself.

Among semi-dogmatical treatises, I would carnestly commend to the attention of grave thinkers the recent contributions to Biblical Psychology which are occasionally alluded to in the notes (comp. 1 Tim. iii. 16). Without needlessly entrammelling ourselves with arbitrary systems, without yielding too prone an assent to quasi-philosophical theories in a subject that involves much that is equivocal or indemonstrable, it seems still our duty to endeavor
to grasp the general principles of psychology, which appear to have been recognized by the sacred writers, and to realize those aspects under which they viewed the parts and portions of our composite nature. No thoughtful man, after reading Philo, and observing how deeply psychological speculations, sufficiently consistent and harmouious, give their tinge to his writings, could hesitate to believe that a contemporary, at least as well educated as the Jew of Alexandria, elevated by a higher consciousness, and illumined by a truer knowledge, both thought and wrote on fixed principles, and used language that is no less divinely inspired than humanly consistent and intelligible. It is but a false or otiose criticism that would persuade us that the terms with which St. Paul designated the different portions of our immaterial nature were rague, uncertain, and interchangeable; it is indeed an idle assertion that Biblical Psychology can be safely disregarded by a thoughtful expositor.
A slight addition has been made to the purely critical notices. As in the former Commentaries, the Text is that of Tischendorf, changed only where the editor did not appear to have made a sound decision. These changes, as before, are noted immediately under the text. In addition to this, however, in the present case, brief remarks are incorporated in the notes, apprizing the reader of any variations in the leading critical editions which may scem to deserve his attention. An elementary knowledge of Sacred Criticism can never be dispensed with, and it is my earnest hope that the introduction of criticism into the body of the notes may be a humble means of presenting this subject to the student in a form somewhat less repulsive and forbidding than that of the mere critical anmotation. Separate notes of this kind are, I fear, especially in the case of younger men, systematically disregarded; when, however, thus incorporated with grammatical and philological notices, when thus giving and receiving illustration from the context with which they are surrounded, it is my hope that I may decoy the reader into spending some thoughts on what seem to be, and what seem not to be, the words of Inspiration, on what may fairly claim to be the true accents of the Eternal Spirit, and what are, only too probably, the mere glosses, the figments, the errors, or the perversions of man.

Possibly a more interesting addition will be found in the citations of authorities. I have at last been enabled to carry out, though to a very liuited extent, the long cherished wish of using some of the best Versions of antiquity for exegetical purposes. Hitherto, though I have long and deeply felt their importance, I have been unable to use any except the Tulgate and the Old Latin. I have now, however, acquired such a rudimentary knowledge of Syriac, and in a less degree of Gothic, as to he able to state some of the interpretations which those very ancient and venerable Veraions present.

The Latin, the Syriac, and the Gothic have been somewhat carefully compared throughout these Epistles. I know that my deficiency in the two latter languages will be plainly apparent, and I seek in no way to disguise it; this only I may be permitted to say, in justice to myself, that the Latin interpretations annexed to the words are not borrowed from current translations, but are fairly derived from the best glossaries and lexicons to which I have had access. Mistakes I know there must be, but at any rate these mistakes are my own. These it is perhaps nearly impossible for a novice to hope to escape ; as in both the Syriac and Gothic, but more especially the former, the lexicographical aids are not at present of a character that can be fully relied on. And it is here that, in the application of ancient Versions, the greatest caution is required. It is idle and profitless to adduce the interpretation of a Version, especially in single words, unless the usual and current meaning of those words is more restricted or defined than in the original. Half the mistakes that have occurred in the use of the Peshito, - mistakes from which the pages of scholars like De Wette are not wholly free, are referable to this head. It is often perfectly apparent that the partial interpretation supplied by the Latin translation appended to the Version, has caused the Version itself to be cited as supporting some restricted gloss of the original Greek words, while in reality the words both in the original and in the Version are of equal latitude, and perhaps both equally indeterminate.

This error I have especially endeavored to avoid; but that I have always succeeded is far more than I dare hope.
In thus breaking ground in the ancient Versions, I would here very earnestly invite fellow-laborers into the same field. It is not easy to imagine a greater service that might be rendered to Scriptural exegesis than if scholars would devote themselves to the hearty study of one or more of these Versions. I dwell upon the term scholars, for it would be perhaps almost worse than useless to accept illustrations from a Version, unless they were also associated with a sound and accurate knowledge of the original Greek. This applies especially to the Syriac ; and the remark is of some moment; for it is now a common opinion among many Oriental scholars, that the language of the New Testament is yet to receive, in a mere grammatical point of view, its most complete illustration from Syriac. That there are some points of similarity, no student in both languages could fail to observe; but it may be seriously doubted whether one-tenth of the suspected Syriasms of the New Testament are not solely referable to the changing and deteriorated constructions of later Greek. To accumulate Syriac illustrations, which may only serve to obscure or supersede our accurate study of later Greek, is a very doubfful, and perhaps profitless, application of labor:

Under these, and perhaps a few other, limitations, the study of the ancient Versions for exegetical purposes may be very earnestly recommended. The amount of labor will not be very formidable, and in some cases we have fair, if not good, literary appliances. There seems good reason for not going beyond the Syriac, the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Gothic, the Coptic, and the Ethiopic. The remaining Versions are of doubtful value. The Armenian, though so much extolled, is said to have undergone no less serious than unsatisfactory alterations. The Arabic Versions are of very mixed origin ; the Slavonic is late; the Georgian has been but little used, and is deemed to be of no great value; the Persian and Anglo-Saxon, as far as they extend, are not free from suspicion of dependence, the one on the Syriac, the other on the Vulgate. For the present, at any rate, the Syriac, Old Latin, Vulgate, Gothic, Coptic, and Ethiopic are all that need demand attention. Most of these are rendered perfectly accessible by the labors of recent scholars. The Syriac has been often reprinted ; grammars in that language are common enough, but the Lexicons are but few and unsatisfactory. ${ }^{1}$ The Old Latin I fear is only accessible by means of the large work of Sabatier, or Tischendorf's expensive edition of the Codex Claromontanus.

The Gothic, independently of not being at all difficult to the German or Anglo-Saxon scholar, has been admirably edited. In addition to the very valuable edition of De Gabelentz and Loebe, and the cheap Latin translation of that work in Migne's Patrology, there is the available edition of Massmann, to which, as in the case of the larger work of De Gabelentz and Loebe, a grammar, and perhaps glossary, is to be added. In addition to the lexicon attached to De Gabelentz and Loebe's edition, we have also the Glossary of Schulze (Magdeb. 1848) both, as far as my very limited experience extends, works constructed on sound principles of philology. In the Coptic there is a cheap and portable edition of the Epistles by Boetticher; and, with the Grammar by Tattam, and the Lexicon by the same author, or the Glossary by Peyron, it is not very probable that the student will encounter much difficulty. Of the Ethiopic, at present, I know nothing; an early edition of this version will be found in Walton's Polyglott ; the Latin translation has been re-edited by Bode, and the original Version edited in a very excellent way by Mr. Platt. An Ethiopic Grammar is announced by Dillman, but I should fear that there is no better lexicon than that of Castell. ${ }^{2}$ The study of this language will be perhaps somewhat advanced by a forthcoming pentaglott edition of Jonah (Williams and Norgate), which is to include the Ethiopic, and to have glossaries attached.

[^4]I sincerely trust that these brief notices may tempt some of our Biblical scholars to enter upon this important and edifying field of labor.

The notes to the Translation will be found a little more full (see Introductory Notice), and, as the subject of a Revised Translation is now occupying considerable attention, a little more explicit on the subject of different renderings and the details of translation generally. With regard to this very important subject, the revision of our Authorized Version, I would fain here make a few observations, as I am particularly anxious that my humble efforts in this direction should not be misinterpreted or misunderstood.

What is the present state of feeling with regard to a revision of our present Version? It seems clear that there are now three parties among us. The first, those who either from what seem seriously mistaken views of a translation of the Holy Scripture, or from sectarian prejudice, are agitating for a new Translation. The second, those who are desirous for a revision of the existing Version, but who somewhat differ in respect of the proposed alterations, and the principles on which they are to be introduced. The third, those who from fear of unsettling the religious belief of weaker brethren are opposed to alterations of any kind; positive and demonstrable error in the representation of the words of Inspiration being in their judgment less pernicious than change. Of these three parties the first is far the smallest in point of numbers, but the most persistent in activities; the second class is daily increasing, yet at present greatly inferior both in numbers and influence to the third.

Which of these three parties will prevail? We may fervently trust not the first. Independently of the extreme danger of unsettling the cherished convictions of thousands, of changing language that las spoken to doubting or suffering hearts with accents that have been to them like the voice of God himself, - independently of reversing a traditional principle of revision that has gained strength and reception since the days of Tyndale,-independently of sowing a strife in the Church of which our children and children's children may reap the bitter fruits, -independently of all these momentous considerations, - have we any good reason for thinking that, in a mere literary point of view, it would be likely to be an improvement on the Old Translation? The almost pitiable attempts under the name of New Translations that have appeared in the last twenty years, the somewhat low state of Biblical scholarship, the diminished and diminishing vigor of the popular language of our day, are facts well calculated to sober our expectations and qualify our self-confidence.
But are we unreservedly to join the third party? God forbid. If we are truly and heartily persuaded that there are errors and inaccuracies in our Version, if we know that though by far the best and most faithful translation
that the world has ever seen, it still shares the imperfections that belong to every human work, however noble and exalted, - if we feel and know that these imperfections are no less patent than remediable, then surely it is our duty to Him who gave that blessed Word for the guidance of man, through evil report and through good report, to labor by gentle counsels to supply what is lacking and correct what is amiss, to render what has been blessed with great measures of perfection yet more perfect, and to hand it down, thus marked with our reverential love and solicitude, as the best and most blessed heritage we have to leave to them who shall follow us.
It is in vain to cheat our own souls with the thought that these errors are either insignificant or imaginary. There are errors, there are inaccuracies, there are misconceptions, there are obscurities, not indeed so many in number or so grave in character as the forward spirits of our day would persuade us of, - but there are misrepresentations of the language of the Holy Ghost, and that man who, after being in any degree satisfied of this, permits himself to lean to the counsels of a timid or popular obstructiveness, or who, intellectually unable to test the truth of these allegations, nevertheless permits himself to denounce or deny them, will, if they be true, most surely at the dread day of final account, have to sustain the tremendous charge of having dealt deceitfully with the inviolable Word of God.
But are we to take no thought of the weaker brethren, whose feelings may be lacerated, or whose conscience may be offended, by seeming innovations? That be far from us. We must win them by gentle wisdom; we must work conviction in their minds by showing how little, comparatively speaking, there is that is absolutely wrong, - how persuasively it may be amended, how we may often recur to the expressions of our older Versions, and from those rich stores of language, those treasuries of pure and powerful English, may find the very rectification we would fain adopt, the very translation we are seeking to embody in words. No revision of our Authorized Version can hope to meet with approval or recognition that ignores the labors of those wise and venerable men who first enabled our forefathers to read in their own tongue of the marvellous works and the manifold wisdom of God.

Let there be then no false fears about a loving and filial revision of our present Version. If done in the spirit and with the circumspection that marked the revision of that predecessor to which it owes its own origin and existence, no conscience, however tender, either will be or ought to be wounded. Nay, there seems intimation in their very preface that our last translators expected that others would do to them as they had done to those who had gone before them; and if they could now rise from their graves and aid us by their counsels, which side would they take? Would they stay our hands if they saw us seeking to perfect their work? Would they not
rather join with us, even if it led sometimes to the removal or dereliction of the monuments of their own labor, in laying out yet more straightly the way of divine Truth?

How this great work is to be accomplished in detail is not for such a one as me to attempt to define. This only I will say, that it is my honest conviction that for any authoritative revision we are not yet mature, either in Biblical learning or Hellenistic scholarship. There is good scholarship in this country, superior probably to that of any nation in the world, but it has certainly not yet been sufficiently directed to the study of the New Testament (for of the New Testament only am I now speaking) to render any national attempt at a revision either hopeful or lastingly profitable. Our best and wisest course seems to be this, - to encourage small bands of scholars to make independent efforts on separate books, to invite them manfully to face and court impartial criticism, and so by their very failures to learn practical wisdom, and out of their censors to secure coadjutors, and by their partial successes to win over the prejudiced and the gainsaying. If a few such attempts were to be made, and they were to meet with encouragement and sympathy, such a stimulus would be given to Biblical studies that a very few years would elapse before England might be provided with a company of wise and cunning craftsmen, into whose hands she might hopefully confide her jewel of most precious price.

A single word only with regard to the translation which accompanies this volume. It is exactly similar in principles and construction to the former attempts, - attempts made at a time when the question of a revision of the Authorized Version had been but little agitated. It lays no presumptuous claim to be a sample of what an authoritative revision ought to be. It is only the effort of a fallible and erring man, striving honestly and laboriously, and on somewhat fixed principles, to present to a few students of his own time a version for the closet, a version possibly more accurate than that which it professes to amend, yet depending on it and on the older Versions for all the life and warmth with which it may be animated or quickened.

The time and pains I have bestowed on this translation are excessive, and yet in the majority of corrections I feel how little cause I have for satisfaction.

Lastly, with regard to the Epistles themselves now before us, it remains only to commend them to the reader's most earnest and devout attention. 'They are distinguished by many peculiarities of language, and many singularities of expression, and are associated torether by an inter-dependence of thought that is noticeable and characteristic. They seem all composed at a time when the earthly pilgrimage of the great Apostle was drawing to its close, and when all the practical wisdom of that noble and loving heart was
spread out for the benefit of his own children of the faith, and for the edification of the Church in all ages. On the question of their genuineness, without entering upon investigations which would be foreign to the nature of this Commentary, it will not be, perhaps, presumptuous to say that a very eareful study of their language and turns of expression has left on my mind a most fixed and most unalterable conviction that they came from no other hand and heart than those of the great Apostlo of the Gentiles, and that it seems hard to understand how accomplished scholars, like De Wette, could so decidedly maintain the contrary hypothesis. This conviction, however, has never prevented me from freely and frankly calling attention to all the peculiarities in thoughts, words, and expressions which characterize the three Epistles, but which, nevertheless, when viewed in connection with the age and experiences of the sacred writer, and the peculiar nature of the errors he was opposing, can cause neither surprise nor difficulty.
In the present Commentary I am much less indebted to the labors of my predecessors than in the two former Epistles. The commentary of IIuther, except in the Prolegomena, is a sad falling off, after the able and scholarlike expositions of Meyer. De Wette, owing to his doubts about the authorship, is often perplexed and unsatisfactory. I have derived benefit from the commentary of Wiesinger, which, though somewhat prolix, and deficient in force and compression, may still be heartily commended to the student. The commentary of Leo is mainly sound in scholarship, but not characterized by any great amount of research. The commentary on the second Epistle to Timothy was written some years after that on the first, and is a noticeable improvement. The commentaries of Mack, Matthies, and Heydenreich (of whom, however, I know very little), are useful in examples and illustrations, but perhaps will hardly quite repay the labor of steady perusal. Something less may be said of Flatt and Wegscheider. The Danish commentary of Bp . Möller is brief and sensible, but lays no claim to very critical scholarship. I have made far more use of the extremely good commentary of the distinguished Hellenist, Coray. It is written in modern Greek,
 (rum), and, with the exception of the somewhat singular fact that Coray seems only to have known the Greek commentators through the medium of Suicer, shows very extensive reading, and generally a very sound judgment. It is very remarkable that this able commentary, though more than five-andtwenty years before the world, should have attracted so little attention. As far as my observation extends, it is not referred to by any English or foreign commentator, and there are not many expositions on this group of epistles that more thoroughly deserve it.

These, with the i'atristic commentators, the able Romanist expositors,

Justiniani, Cornelius a Lapide, and Estius, and a few other writers noticed in the preface to the Epistle to the Galatians, are the primcipal authorities which I have used in the present Commentary.

I now commit this volume to the reader, with the humble prayer to Almighty God that He may vouchsafe to bless this effort to expound and illustrate a most vital and most consoling portion of His holy Word; may He pity the weakness and forgive the errors of His servant.

TPIAE, MONAE', 'EAEHEON.

## PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION.

Ture second edition of the Epistles contained in this volume has been thus long delayed, that it might not appear before the reader till the interpretad tions advanced in the first edition had been fully and maturely considered, with reference to the opinions of more recent interpreters.

The result of the revision is but a very slight amount of change in the interpretations formerly proposed, ${ }^{1}$ and, it may not perhaps be improper to add, an increasing confidence in a system of interpretation which has thus apparently stood the test of the rigorous and lengthened reconsideration to which its details have been subjected in the preparation of this edition. Though substantial change has been thus slight, it will still be found that improvements and slight additions appear on nearly every page, and that the edition has some claim to be entitled, revised and eularged. I may briefly specify that the references to ancient Versions are increased, that the grammatical notices ${ }^{2}$ are occasionally expanded, and that the references, especially to Scripture, have been nearly all verified anew. Mistakes in this lastmentioned portion of the work, due perhaps less to the printer than to the wearied eye of the writer, may, I fear, still be found; but $I$ trust it will be at wide intervals, and only to such an extent as may admit of easy rectification.
For further details and comments I may now refer to the Preface to the first edition of this Commentary, and to the Preface to the second edition of the Commentary on the Ephesians, where the general standard which I have latterly attempted to reach is more fully stated. To this standard each succeeding volume has naturally tended to approach somewhat more nearly

[^5]than that which preceded it. What was once almost purely critical and grammatical has now confessedly become also exegetical; yet still to no further extent than to enable the student to grasp the general connection of the holy and inspired Original, as well as to understand the force of isolated words and expressions.

May God's blessing go with this volume, and mercifully enable it, in these our days of doubt and trial, to minister to the Truth as it is in His Blessed Son, and, in its humble measure and degree, to set forth the blessed teaching ${ }_{5}$ and warnings and consolations of the inspired and saving Words of Life.

Cambridge, May, 1861.

THE FIRST EPISTLE T0 TIMOTITY.

## INTRODUCTION.

Tre date and general circumstances under which this and the accompanying Epistles were written have long been the subjects of discussion and controversy.
As our opinion on these points must first be stated, it may be said briefly, - (a) that when we duly consider that close connection in thought, subject, expressions, and style which exists between the First Epistle to Timothy and the other two Pastoral Epistles, it seems in the highest degree incredible, that they could have been composed at intervals of time widely separated from each other. When we further consider ( $b$ ) the almost insuperable difficulty in assigning any period for the composition of this group of Epistles in that portion of the Apostle's life and labors included in the Acts; (c) the equally great, or even greater, difficulty in harmonizing the notes of time and place in these Epistles with those specified in the Apostle's journeys as recorded by St. Luke ; and add to this the important subsidiary arguments derived from (d) the peculiar and developed character of the false teachers and false teaching alluded to in these Epistles (1 Tim. i. 4 sq.; iv. 1 sq.; vi. 3 sq.; 2 Tim. ii. 16 sq.; iii. 6 sq.; iv. 4 ; Titus i. 10 sq.; iii. 9 sq.), and from (e) the advanced state of Church organization which they not only imply but specify ( 1 Tim. iii. 1 sq.; v. 3 sq.; Titus i. 5 sq.; ii. 1 sq.), it seems plainly impossible to refuse assent to the ancient tradition that St. Paul was twice imprisoned at Rome (Euseb. Hist. Eccl. ri. 2), and further to the simple, reasonable, and highly natural opinion that the First Epistle to Timothy and the other two Epistles which stand thus closely associated with it are to be assigned to the period between these two imprisonments.

This being premised, we may now express the opinion that the present Epistle to Timothy was written by the Apostle towards the close of the above-mentioned period (perhaps A. D. 66 or 67 ), while he was passing through Macedonia (ch. i. 3), after a probable journey to Spain (Conybeare and Howson, St. Paul, Vql. ir. p. 548, ed. 2) and a return to Ephesus (comp. ch. i. 3), at which city he had left Timothy in charge of the local church.

The olject of the Epistle may be clearly inferred from ch. i. 3, 4, and iii. 14,15 , and may be roughly defined as twofold; first, to exhort Timothy to counteract the developing heresies of the time, and secondly, to instruct him in all the particulars of his duties as overseer and Bishop of the important Church of Ephesus. With this design the contents of the Epistle, which are very varied and comprehensive, have been well shown by Dr. Davidson to accord in all respects most fully and completely; see Introduction, Vol. III. p. 39 sq., where the student will also find a good summary of the contents of the Epistle.

In reference to the genuineness and authenticity of this Epistle, with which that of the other Pastoral Epistles is intimately connected, we may briefly remark, ( $a$ ) that there was never any doubt entertained in the ancient Church that these Epistles were written by St. Paul (see the testimonies in Lardner and Davidson), and (b) that of the objections urged by modern scepticism, the only one of any real importance - the peculiarities of phrases and expressions (see Huthex, Einleitung, p. 50, and the list in Conybeare and Howson, St. Paul, Vol. Ir. p. 663 sq. ed. 2) - may be so completely removed by a just consideration of the date of the Epistles, the peculiar nature of the subjects discussed, and the plain, substantial accordance in all main points with the Apostle's general style (admitted even by De Wette), that no doubt of the authorship ought now to be entertained by any calm and reasonable enquirer: see the very claborate and able defence of Davidson, Introduction, Vol. III. p. 100 sq.

# THE FIRST EPISTLE T0 TLIOTHY. 

## CHAPTERI.




1. ${ }^{2} \pi \delta \sigma \tau \circ \lambda$ os X. '1.] 'an Apostle of Jesus Christ;' an Apostle (in the higher and more especial sense, see notes on Gal. i. 1, and on Eph. iv. 11), who not merely derived his commission from, but belonged to Christ (gen. poss.) as His minister and servant; see notes on Eph. i. 1. The use of this formal designation does not seem intended merely to support the authority of Timothy (Heydenr.), or to imply a destination of the Epistle for others (Calvin), or for the Church at large (compare Bp. Möller), but simply to define and maintain the true nature of the document. As this epistle may be most naturally regarded as an official letter, the Apostle appropriately designates himself by his solemn and official title: comp. 2 Tim. i. l sq., and esp. Tit. i. l sq., where this seems still more apparent. In Philem. 1, on the other hand, the Apostle, in exquisite accordance with the nature and subject of that letter, styles himself simply $\delta$ ह́ $\sigma \mu \iota o s$ X $\rho \iota \sigma \tau o \hat{v}$ 'I $\eta \sigma o \hat{v}$; see notes in loc.
$\kappa \alpha \tau^{2} \in \pi \iota \tau \alpha \gamma \grave{\eta} \nu$ © $\left.\Theta o \hat{\nu}\right]$ 'according to the commandment of God;'
not simply equivalent to the customary
 Eph. i. 1, Col. i. 1, 2 Tim. i. 1; comp. Möller), but pointing more precisely to the immediate antecedents of the Apostle's call (the éntray) was the result of the $ง$ sé $\lambda \eta \mu \alpha$ ), and thus perhaps still more serving to enhance the authoritative nature of his commission : see Tit. i. 3, and comp. Rom. xvi. 26 , the only other passages where the expression occurs.
$\sigma \omega \tau \hat{\eta} \rho o s \quad \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu]$ 'our Saviour;' not merely in reference to His preserving and sustaining power (compare Zeìs $\sigma \omega \tau \eta \rho$, etc.), but to His redeeming love in Christ, more distinctly expressed, Jude 25, $\sigma \omega \tau \hat{\eta} \rho t \dot{\imath}_{\eta}^{\mu} \mu \omega \hat{\nu}$ ठı ${ }^{\text {' }}$ I. X. (Tisch., Lachm.) ; compare 2 Cor. v. 19, and see Reuss, Théol. Chret. iv. 9, Vol. nı. p. 93. This designation of God is peculiar to the Pastoral Epistles (1 Tim. ii. 3, iv. 10 , Tit. i. 3, ii. 10 , iii. 4), Luke i. 47, and Jude 25, but is sufficiently common in the LXX, e.g. Psalm. xxiv. 5; Isaiah xii. 2, xlv. 15, 21. Its grammatical connection with $\Theta \epsilon \delta s$ is slightly diversified in the N. T. : in 1 Tim. iv. $10 \sigma \omega \tau \eta \rho$

#   'I $\eta \sigma o \hat{\imath} \tau o \hat{~ K v \rho i o v ~} \dot{\eta} \mu \omega \hat{\nu}$. 

is added epexegetically in the relative
 l. c., here, and Jude 25 , it stands in simple, or what is termed parathetic apposition (Krüger, Sprachl. § 57.9) to ©єós, - in the first passage with, in the two latter without, the article. In all the other places the formula is $\delta \sigma \omega \tau \eta \rho \rho \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ ©єós; the tenor of the sentence (esp. I Tim. ii. 3, 4) probably suggesting the prominence of the appellation. According to Huther, the anarthrous $\sigma \omega \tau \eta े \rho$ $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ is here an adjectival apposition appended to ©єoर̂, while in Luke $l$. c. ( $\tau \hat{\omega} \sigma \omega \tau \hat{\eta} \rho \stackrel{\mu}{ } \mu v$ ), the article marks it as a. substantive. This is very doubtful; the usage of Attic Greek in similar cases seems here correctly maintained; - if the name of the deity have the article, the appellation has it also; if the former be anarthrous, so usually is the latter; see Krüger, Sprachl. § 50. 8. 10.
 not merely the object of it (Leo), nor the author of it (Flatt), but its very substance and foundation; ' in co solo residet tota salutis nostræ materia,' Calv.:
 $\tau \hat{\eta} s$ ठठछॄŋร, and comp. Eph. ii. 14, aủros
 notes) the abstract subst. must be taken in a sense equally full and comprehensive. The same expression occurs in Ignat. Trall. 2.
2. T $\iota \mu$ oì $\epsilon \in \kappa$ к. $\tau_{0} \lambda_{\text {. ] }}$ ' to Timothy my true child.' There is no necessity to supply xaipeıv; for; as Möller, rightly observes; the following wish forms really part of the salutation. It is best, in accordance with the punctuation adopted in the former Epp., to place a period after $\pi!\sigma \tau \epsilon \iota$; for although in St. Paul's salutations, with the exception of this passage, 2 Tim. i. 2, and Tit. i. 4; the
resumption is made more apparent by the insertion of $\dot{v} \mu i \nu$ after $\chi$ d́pıs, yet this appears to have arisen either from the plurality of the persons saluted (e.g. Phil., Philem.) or the generic expression ( $\uparrow \hat{\eta} \hat{\epsilon} \kappa \kappa \lambda \eta \sigma i \not \subset ~ 1 ~ a n d ~ 2 ~ T h e s s . ~ i . ~ I, ~ \tau a i ̂ s ~$ ékкл $\begin{aligned} & \text { oiaus Gal. i. 2) under which they }\end{aligned}$ are grouped. Here the resumptive pronoun would be unnecessary. On the form of salutation see notes on Gal. i. 4 and Eph. i. 2. $\quad \epsilon \nu \pi\{\sigma \tau \in \ell\}^{\text {' }}$ in (the) fuith,' 'in the sphere of Christian faith;' not to be connected merely with $\gamma \nu \eta \sigma i \omega$ (a grammatically admissible, though not natural connection; see Winer, Gr. § 20. 2, p. 124), or merely with $\tau \in \in \kappa \nu \oplus($ (compare Alf.), but with the compound idea $\gamma \nu \eta \sigma i \omega$ тéк $\kappa \omega$. Every part of the appositional member has thus its complete significance : $\tau \in \mathcal{K} \nu \varphi$ denotes the affectionate (1 Cor. iv. 17, тékvò ả $\gamma a \pi \eta \tau \delta \partial \nu)$, as well as spiritual (Philem. 10) nature of the connection; $\gamma \nu \eta \sigma\{\omega$ (not 'dilecto,' Vulgate, but $\left.\right|_{i-1} ^{0}$ [true] Syr.; joined with oै orws $\omega_{\omega} \nu$, Plato, Politic. p. 293, and opp. to עó̀ós, Philo, Somn. II. 6, Vol. x. p. 665 , ed. Mang.) specifies the genuineness and reality of it (Phil. iv. 3), 一 $\grave{\eta} \nu \dot{\alpha} \kappa \rho \iota \beta \hat{\eta}$
 $\tau \eta \tau \alpha$, Chrys.; $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \pi\{\sigma \tau \in \iota$ marks the sphere in which such a connection is alone felt and realized, - more generally, but not less suitably (De W.), ex-
 $\hat{\epsilon} \lambda \in O s]$ The addition of this substantive to the usual form of salutation, $\chi$ dapts кal eip $\eta \nu \eta$, is peculiar to the Pastoral Epp. (Tit. i. 4, Rec., Lachm., is however doubtful) ; see 2 John 3, and Jude 2. It here probably serves to individualize, and to mark the deep and affectionate interest of the Apostle in his convert;

I exhort thee to abide still $\quad 3 \mathrm{KaN} \mathrm{\omega}$ 位
in Ephesus，and to repress teachers of other doctrine and would－be teachers of the law：the law is not for the righteous，but for open sinners and opponents of sound doctrine，as the spirit of the Gospel shows．
 Chrys．：see notes on Eph．i． 2.

3．$\kappa \alpha \mathfrak{\omega}$ s］＇Even as；＇protasis，to which there is no expressed apodosis （neither at ver．5，nor ver．18，Beng．）， but to which the obvious and natural one，ойтш каl $\nu \hat{\nu} \nu \pi а р а к а \lambda \omega ิ ~(c o m p . ~ c h . ~ i i . ~$ 1），can easily be supplied；see Winer， $G r . \S 63.1$, p． 503 ，where there is a good list of the imaginary parentheses in St．Paul＇s Epp．All other explanations， whether by an interpolation before＂$\nu \mathrm{va}$ （＇ita facito，＇Erasm．），or by an arbi－ trary change of reading（ $\pi \rho o \sigma \mu$ eivas，－ Schneckenb．Beitr．p，183），seem forced and unsatisfactory．$\quad \pi \alpha \rho \in \kappa \alpha \dot{\lambda} \in \sigma \alpha]$ ＇I besought，＇Auth．Ver．：йкоvє т $\boldsymbol{\tau} \pi \rho о \sigma \eta-$

 $\kappa \alpha ́ \lambda \in \sigma \alpha ́ \sigma \epsilon$ ，Chrys．；compare Philem．8，
 paka入ิ．The above comment is cer－ tainly not invalidated by Titus i． 5 （Huther）；for there the use of $\delta \iota \epsilon \tau a \xi \alpha$ d－ $\mu \eta \nu$ was probably suggested by the spe－ cific instructions which follow the general order．It may be observed，however， that $\pi а р \alpha к \alpha \lambda \hat{\omega}$ is a word of most frequent occurrence in St．Paul＇s Epp．，being used above fifty times，and with varying shades of meaning（comp．notes on Eph． iv．1， 1 Thess．v．11），while of the other words mentioned by Chrys．，one only （ $\dot{e} \pi เ \tau \alpha ́ \sigma \sigma \omega$ ）is used by the Apostle，and that only once，Philem．l．c．No undue stress，then（＇recommended，＇Peile）， should be laid in translation．
$\pi \rho \circ \sigma \mu \in i \nu \alpha l]$＇to abide still，＇tarry on，＇ ＇ut permaneres，＇Beza；certainly not，in an ethical sense，＇to adhere to a plan＇ （Paulus），－an interpretation framed only to obviate supposed historical diffi－ culties：see Wieseler，Chronol．p． 302. The tense cannot be pressed；as the aor． inf．is only used on the principle of the
＇temporum то ката́л入ŋлоу＇（Schæfer， Demosth．Vol．irr．p．432），－a usage not always sufficiently borme in mind． All that can be said is，that if the pres． inf．had been used（comp．Acts xiv．22）， the contemplated duration of Timothy＇s stay at Ephesus would have been more especially marked．In the present case no inference can be safely drawn．On the use of the inf．pres，and aor，after
 see Winer，Gr．§ 44．7．c，p．296，comp． Lobeck，Phryn．p． 748 sq．；and on the general distinction between these tenses in the inf．，consult the good note of Stallbaum on Plato，Euthyd．p． 140.
$\pi o p \in v \delta \mu \in \nu \circ s$ ］＇when I was on my way，＇＇as I was going，＇Hamm．It is not grammatically possible，as De Wette seems to imagine，to refer this participle to Timothy；see Winer，Gr．§ 44．3，p． 287．Such participial anacolutha as those cited by Matth．，e．g．Eph：iii．19， iv．2，Col．iii． 16 （but see Meyer），are very dissimilar ：there the distance of the part．from the words on which it is grammatically dependent，and still more the obvious prominence of the clause（see notes on Eph．iii．18）render such a con－ struction perfectly intelligible；here no such reasons can possibly be urged；see exx．in Winer，Gr．§ 63．2，p． 505. There is confessedly great difficulty in harmonizing this historical notice with those contained in the Acts．Three hypotheses have been proposed，to all of which there are very grave objections， historical and exegetical．These can here only be noticed very briefly．（a） If the journey here mentioned be that related Acts xx．1，2．（Theodoret，Herm－ sen），how is it possible to reconcile the stay of Timothy at Ephesus with the fact that St．Paul despatched him a short time only before his own departure，

to Macedonia (Acts xix. 22) and thence to Corinth (1 Cor. iv. 17), and that we further find him at the latter place ( 2 Cor. i. 1) with the Apostle? Moreover, when St. Paul then left Ephesus, he certainly contemplated no speedy return (1 Tim. iii. 14) ; for see Acts xix. 21, xx. 3 : comp. Huther, Einleit. p. 13, 14, Wieseler, Chronol. p. 290 sq. (b) If St. Paul be supposed to have sent Timothy forward to Ephesus from Achaia (Matthew), having himself the intention of following; can this be reconciled with Acts $\mathrm{xx} .4, \sigma v \nu \in i \pi \in \tau o$, and with the fact that when St. Paul was near Ephesus, and might have carried out his intention,
 Wieseler, p. 294, Wiesinger, Einleit. p. 370 sq. (c) Even Wieseler's opinion (Chronol. p. 313, comp. p. 295 sq.) that this was an unrecorded journey during St. Paul's 2-3 years' stay at Ephesus, though more reconcilable with historical data, seems inconsistent with the character of an Epistle which certainly recognizes (a) a fully developed form of error (contrast the future $\epsilon i \sigma \in \lambda \in \dot{\sigma} \sigma o \nu \tau a l$, Acts xx. 29), ( $\beta$ ) an advanced state of Church discipline, not wholly probable at this earlier date, and further $(\gamma)$ gives instructions to Timothy that seem to contemplate his continued residence at Ephesus, and an uninterrupted performance of his episcopal duties; see Huther, Einleit. p. 17. These objections are so grave that we seem justified in remanding this journey (with Theophyl., CEum., and recently Huther and Wiesinger) to some time after the first imprisonment at Rome, and consequently, beyond the period included by St. Luke in the Acts: see Pearson, Ann. Paul. Vol. I. p. 393, Guerike, Einleit. § 48. 1, p. 396 (ed. 2), Paley, Hor. Paul. ch. xı. iv $\alpha \pi \alpha \rho \alpha \gamma \dot{\gamma} \in\{\lambda \eta s]$ ' that thou mightest command:' purpose contemplated in the
tarrying of Timothy. The verb here used does not apparently mark that it was to be done openly (Matth.), but authoritatively; тapaka入eiv being the milder, $\pi a p a \gamma \gamma \epsilon \in \lambda \lambda \epsilon \iota \nu$ the stronger word; comp. 2 Thess. iii. 12. In the Epistle to Titus the Cretan character suggests the use of still more decided language ; e. $g$.
 à $\pi о \tau o ́ \mu \omega s . \quad \tau \iota \sigma[\nu]$ 'certain persons,' 'quibusdam,' Vulg. : so ver. 6, iv. 1; v. 15,24 , vi. 21 . We cannot safely deduce from this that the number of evil teachers was small (Huther); the indef. pronoun is more probably slightly contemptuous: 'le mot $\tau t v e s$ a quelque chose de méprisant,' Arnaud on Jude 4 ; compare Gal. ii. 12. $\dot{\in} \tau \in \rho \circ \delta, \delta \alpha \sigma \kappa \alpha-$ $\lambda \in \hat{\imath} \nu]$ 'to be teachers of other doctrine,'
 trinas Syr.; $\delta l_{s} \lambda \in \gamma \delta \mu$, here and ch. vi. 3. Neither the form nor meaning of this word presents any real difficulties. In form it is analogous with é $\tau \in \rho \circ \zeta v \gamma \in i v$, 2 Cor. vi. 14, and is the verbalized derivative of é $\tau \in \rho о \delta \delta \delta \alpha_{\sigma}^{\sigma} \kappa \alpha \lambda$ оs (compare

 the $\dot{\varepsilon} \tau \in \rho o \delta i \delta$.' The meaning is equally perspicuous if we adhere to the usual and correct meaning of $\epsilon$ ÉTEpos (distinction of kind, - see notes on Gal. i. 6) : thus é $\tau \in p o \delta \iota \delta$. implies 'teaching;' - not necessarily 'what is doctrinally false,' nor even so much as 'what is strange, but 'what is different to, what deviates from ('afvigende,' Möller) sound doctrine;' see ch. vi. 3 , where this' meaning is very clearly confirmed. Just as the є $\dot{u} a \gamma \gamma^{\prime} \lambda ı$ ol of the Galatians was érepod from its assimilation of Judaical clements, so here the $\delta \iota \delta a \sigma \kappa a \lambda i a$ was $\dot{\epsilon} \tau \epsilon ́ \rho a$ from its commixture with an unedifying (ver. 4), vain (ver. 6), and morbid (yer. 10) theosophy of similarly Jewish orig-
ination. It will thus be seen that, with Chrysostom, Theodoret, and the other Greck commentators, we regard the error which St. Paul is here condemning, not so much a settled form of heresy, pre-Marcionite or otherwise, as a profitless and addititious teaching which, arising from Jewish (comp. Tit. i. 14), perhaps Cabbalistic, sources, was afterwards an affluent of the later and more definite Gnosticism; see especially Wiesinger, Einleit. § 4, p. 212, Huther, Einleit. p. 41, and (thus far) Schleiermacher, über 1. Tin. p. 83 sq.
4. $\pi p o \pi \in \in \chi \in L \nu]$ ' give heed to,' Auth. Ver., a felicitous translation; so Tit. i. 14. The verb $\pi \rho o \sigma e ́ \chi \epsilon \iota \nu$ does not imply 'fidem adhibere' (Heinr.), and is cer-
 (Krebs, Obs. p. 20t), either here or elsewhere (Acts viii. 6, 11, xvi. 14, al.), but simply indicates a prior and preparatory act, and is, as it were, a mean term between àkoúєıL and $\pi \iota \sigma \tau \in \dot{\varepsilon} \epsilon \iota \nu$; compare
 троб́́é Xov, Joseph. Bell. Jud. vi. 5. 3,
 amples adduced by Krebs and Raphel (Obs. Vol. II. p. 113) only serve to confirm the strict interpretation. The canon of Thom. Maģ ' $\pi \rho \circ \sigma$ '́ $\chi \omega$ Ш đot $\tau \grave{\partial} \nu$ voûv'
 dantly disproved by his commentators; seẹ p. 749, el. Bernard.
$\mu$ úvols
 and endless genealogies.' It is very doubtful whether the popular reference of these terms to the spiritual myths and emanatious of Gnosticism (Tertull. Valent. 3, de Prascr. 33, Irenæus, Har. (Prof.), Grot., Hamm., and most modern commentators) can be fairly sustained. The only two passages that throw any real light on the meaning of these terms are Tit. i. 14, iii. 9. In the former of these the $\mu \hat{\imath \imath}$ or are defined as 'tovōakrol, in the
latter the $\gamma \in v e a \lambda 0 \gamma i a l$ are connected with $\mu d \chi a t ~ \nu o \mu \iota \kappa a l$; in both cases, then, the wopds have there a Jewish reference: $几$ The same must hold in the present case; for the errors described in the two Epp. are palpably too similar to make it at all probable that the terms in which they are here alluded to have any other than a Jewish reference also ; so Chrys., Theodoret, al., compare Ignat. Magn. 8; see esp. Wiesinger, Einleit. p. 211 sq., Neander, Planting, Vol. 1. p. 342 (ed. Bohn). For a discussion of the various references that have been assigned to $\gamma \in \nu \in a \lambda$. in the present passage see the note of De Wette translated by Alford in loc. Thus then $\mu \hat{v} \uparrow$ oc will most probably be, not
 sost.), nor a supplementary $\mathfrak{e} \rho \mu \eta \nu \in$ éa, a סevtépwots (Theod), but generally, Rabbinical fables and fabrications whether in history or doctrine. Again $\gamma \in \nu \in a-$ doylat will be 'genealogies' in the proper sense, with which, however, these wilder speculations were very probably combined, and to which an allegorical interpretation may have been regularly assigned; comp. Dähne, Stud. u. Krit. for 1833, p. 1008. It is curious that Polybius uses both terms in similarly elose connection, Hist. xx. 2. 1.
à $\pi \in \rho \alpha \dot{\nu} \tau 0 \iota s]$ 'endless,' 'interminable,' 'quibus finis non est,' Syr.: : $\pi \in \delta$ ion àmépaytov, Pind. Nem. viri. 38 ; so 3 Macc. ii. 9 , àméf. $\gamma \hat{\eta} \nu$. It does not seem necessary to adopt either the ethical (à $\tau \in \lambda \epsilon$ í $\omega$ tov Hesych., Chrysost. 2) : or logical
 Diog. Laert. vir. 78) meaning of this word. The genealogies were vague, rambling, interminable; it was an ăus-
 $\$ 3$, Vol. II. p. 4, ed. Mangey) that hadno natural or necessary conclusion; compare Polyb. Hist. I. 57. 3, where the simple sense appears similarly main-

## 


tained. $\quad$ I $\boldsymbol{\tau} \iota \nu \in s$ 'inasmuch as they,' 'seeing they;' explanatory use of $8 \sigma \tau$,s, see notes on Gal. iv. 24.
$\zeta \eta \tau$ ท́$\sigma \in \iota s$ ] 'questions;' either subjectively, 'disputings,' Acts xv. 2 (Tisch.); or, more probably, in an objective sense, 'questions of controversy,' 'enquiries,' essentially opposed to faith (Chrysost., Theod.), and of which épets and $\mu \alpha \chi \alpha a$ are the natural and specificd results; see ch. vi. 4, 2 Tim. ii. 23, Tit. iii. 9.
oikovou\{av @єovi] 'God's dispensation,' not 'edifying,' Raphel, Wolf, - a translation which oiкороцia cannot bear; see Polyb. Hist. iv. 65. 11 (cited by Raphel), where the proper translation is 'exsecutio instituti;' and compare Schweigh. Lex. Polyb. s. v. The exact meaning of the term is, however, doubtful. If oiкоуоцia be explained subjectively, 'the stewardship,' scil. 'the exercising of the stewardship' (Conyb. and Hows.), 'the discharge of the functions
 tum,' Beng; comp. 1 Cor. ix. 17, iv. 1), the use of $\pi \alpha \rho \epsilon ́ \chi \epsilon เ \nu$ must be zeugmatic, i.e. involve two different meanings ('prebere, promovere'), unless $\langle\eta \tau \eta \sigma \epsilon$ ts be also explained actively, ${ }^{\circ}$ in which case тapé $\chi \in \iota \nu$ will have a single meaning, but the very questionable one, 'promovere.' If, however, oìcovoula $\Theta \in o \hat{v}$ be taken objectively and passively (Chrys.), the 'dispensation of God ' (gen. of the origin or author; compare notes on 1 Thess. i. 6), i. e. 'the scheme of salvation designed by God, and proclaimed by His Apostles,' with only a remote reference to the olikos $\Theta \in o \hat{u}$ (see notes on Eph. i. 10 ), the meaning of $\langle\eta \tau$. and oikoע, will be more logically symmetrical, and mapé$\dot{\chi} \in \iota y$ can retain its simple sense 'probere:' the fables and genealogies supplied questions of a controversial nature, but not the essence and principles of the
divine dispensation. ... $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ ह̇ $\nu$ $\pi\{\sigma \tau \in \ell]$ 'which is in faith:' further definition of the nature of the oikovouia by a specification of the sphere of its action, - 'faith, not a questioning spirit,' - thus making the contrast with $\left\langle\eta \tau \eta \sigma_{0}\right.$. more clear and emphatic. The easier readings oikoסoulay (found only in $\mathrm{D}^{3}$ ) or oikoסo $\mu \eta_{\nu} \nu$ ( $\mathrm{D}^{1}$; Iren. ap. Epiph.), though appy. supported by several Vv. (aedificationem, Vulg., Clarom., Goth., Syr., al.), cannot possibly be sustained against the authority of all the uncial MSS:, and is probably only due to erroneous transcription, $\delta$ and $\nu$ being confused. How can Bloomf: (ed. 9) adduce the Alex. MS. in favor of oikобоц\{av, and (except from a Lat. transl.) assert that Chrys. and Theod. were not aware of any other reading? These are grave errors.
 'now,' Auth. Ver., Conyb.) the end (aim) of the commandment, etc.;' a contrasted statement of the purpose and aim of sound practical teaching. There ought not to be here any marks of parenthesis (Griesb., Lachm.), as the verse does not commence a now train of thought, but stands in simple antithetical relations ( $\delta \frac{1}{\epsilon}$ ) to ver. 4 , forming at the same time an easy and natural transition to ver. 6 sq , where the errors of the false teachers are more particularly specified. Té $\lambda o s$ is thus not the $\sigma v \mu \pi \lambda \hat{n}^{-}$ pw $\mu$ (Chrys. ; comp. Rom. xiii. 10), the 'palmarium, præcipuum' (Schoettg.), or the 'sum' ('die Hauptsumme,' Luther), -meanings scarcely lexically tenable, - but the 'aim' (Beza, Hamm. 2), as in the expression noticed by Chrys.,
 Chrysost. in loc., - where however the meaning does not seem equally certain. The distinction of Cassian (cited by


Justiniani）between $\sigma \kappa \delta$ тоs，＇id quod arlifices spectare solent，＇and té $\bar{\lambda} a s$ ， ＇quod expetitur $a b$ arte，＇is not fully satisfactory．$\quad \dot{\eta} \pi \alpha \rho \alpha \gamma \gamma \in \lambda i \alpha$ is not the＇lex Mosaica＇（＇pars pro toto，＇ Calv．），nor even the＇lex Evangelica＇ （Corn．a Lap．），both of which meanings are more inclusive than the context seems to require，or the usage of mapar－ $\gamma^{\in} \boldsymbol{\lambda}$ ía in the N．T．（ch．i．18，Acts v．28， xvi．24， 1 Thess，iv．2）will admit of． On the other hand，to refer $\pi a p a \gamma \gamma$ ． simply to the preceding $\pi a \rho a \gamma \gamma \epsilon i \lambda \eta s$

 seems too narrow and exclusive．That it was suggested by the verb just pre－ ceding is not improbable；that it has however a further reference to doctrine in a preceptice form generally，－＇prac－ tical teaching＇（De W．），seems required by the context，and confirmed by the recurrence of the verb in this Ep．；com－ pare ch．iv．11，v．7，vi．13， 17.
${ }_{\alpha}^{\alpha} \gamma \alpha \pi \eta$ ］＇love；＇the ऽ $\eta \tau \eta \sigma \epsilon t s$ engendered $\mu a ́ \chi a s, 2$ Tim．ii．23．The love here mentioned is clearly love to men（ $\hat{\eta}$ ék
 Theophyl．）not love to God and men （Matth．）：＇quum de caritate fit mentio in Scripturâ，scepius ad secundum mem－ brum restringitur，＇Calv．：see esp．Usteri， Lehrb．II．1．4，p． $242 . \quad \hat{\epsilon} \kappa \kappa \alpha \hat{\sim} \alpha-$ pâs kapiias］＇out of，emanuting from， a pure heurt；＇${ }^{\text {ék }}$ with its usual and proper force（Winer，Gr．§ 47．b，p．328） pointing to and marking the inward seat of the a $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{\alpha} \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{2} \eta$ ：comp．Luke $x .27,1$ Pet． i．22．The кapoía，properly the（imag－ inary）seat of the $\psi v \chi$ h（Olsh．Opusc．p． 155），appears very commonly used in Scripture（like the Hebrew $ニ テ 弓$ ）to de－ note the $\psi u \chi$ ）in its active aspects（＇qua－ tenus sentit et agitur et movetur duce spiritu vel carne，＇Olsh．ib．），and may be regarded as the centre both of the feel－
ings and emotions（John xvi．6，Rom． ix．2，al．）and of the thoughts and imag－ inations（Matth．ix 4，xv．19， 1 Cor．iv． 5，al．），though in the latter case more usually with the associated ideas of activity and practical application ；see Beck，Bill．Seelenl．1ir．24．3，p． 94 sq．， and esp．the good collection of exx．in Delitzsch，Bibl．Psychol．Iv．12，p． 204.
$\sigma v \nu \in\{\delta \eta \sigma$ ıs $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \alpha \hat{\imath} \eta \dot{\eta}$ here and ver． 19 （compare 1 Pet．iii． 16 ；ка入クे Heb．xiii． 18；кaэapà 1 Tim．iii．9， 2 Tim．i．3）is connected with $\pi i \sigma$ tis as the true princi－ ple on which its existence depends． Faith，－faith ảvvтórpıtos，though last in the enumeration，is really first in point of origin．It renders the heart pure（Acts xv．9），and in so doing ren－ ders the formerly evil conscience à yast． Thus considered，$\sigma v \nu \epsilon^{i} \hat{\partial} \eta \sigma t s \dot{\alpha} \gamma$ ．would seem to be，not the antecedent of the каэарф̀ карঠía（Hamm．），and certainly not identical with it（Corn．a Lap．，com－ pare Calv．），but its consequent ；＇consci－ entia bona nihil aliud est quam scientia et testimonium animæ affirmantis se pure et sancte vivere，＇Menoch．ap．Pol． Syn．；compare Pearson，Creed，Art．vir． Vol．1．p． 347 （ed．Burton）．On the exact meaning of $\sigma v \nu \in i ́ \delta \eta \sigma t s$ see Sander－ son，de Obl．Consc．1． 4 sq．，Vol．iv．p． 3 （ed．Jacobs．）；on its nature and power， Butler，Serm．2，3，and on its threcfold character（an exponent of moral law，a judge，and a sentiment）the very clear discussion of M＇Cosh，Divine Gov．IIr． 1． 4, p． 291 sq ．It must be remembered， however，that in Scripture these more exact definitions are frequently wholly inapplicable；the $\sigma v \nu \epsilon i \delta \eta \sigma$ is is viewed， not in its abstract nature，but in its prac． tical manifestations ；see Harless，Ethile， §9．$\beta$, p． 35 ．$\dot{\alpha} \nu v \pi$ окрітои\} ＇unfeigned，＇＇undissembled；＇，an epithet of $\pi$ i$\sigma \tau$ ts here and 2 Tim．i． 5 ；of à $\gamma a ́ \pi \eta$ ，Rom．xii．9， 2 Cor．vi．6；of


 $\sigma o \phi i ́ a$, James iii. 17, marking the absence of everything e่тimiaбто⿱ and íтокєкpiuévov (Chrys.). It was a faith not merely in mask and semblance, but in truth and reality : ' notandum epitheton; quo significat fallacem esse ejus professionem ubi non apparet bona conscientia,' Calv. All these epithets have their especial force as hinting at the exactly opposite in the false teachers; they were


 It may be remarked that the common order of subst. and epith. (see Gersdorf, Beitrüge, p. 334 sq.) is here reversed in каЭарф карб. ; so 2 Tim. ii. 22, Heb. х. 22, comp. Rom. ii. 5 ; on the other hand contrast Luke viii. 15, and esp. Psalm
 This is possibly not accidental; the heart is usually so sadly the reverse, so often a кар $\delta i ́ \alpha ~ \pi о \nu \eta \rho \grave{~ a ̀ ~ a ̀ t \iota \sigma \tau i ́ a s, ~ H e b . ~ i i i . ~}$ 12, that the Apostle, perhaps designedly, gives the epithet a slightly distinctive prominence ; see Winer, Gr. § 59. 2, p. 564 (ed. 6).

6 ©̂ע $\tau t \nu \in S$ к. $\left.\tau . \lambda_{0}\right]$ The remark of Schleiermacher (über 1 Tim. p. 161), that this verse evinces an incapacity in the writer to return from a digression, c:annot be substantiated. There is no digression; ver. 5 has an antithetical relation to ver. 4 ; it states what the true aim of the $\pi a p a \gamma \gamma \in \lambda i \alpha$ was, and thus forms a natural transition to ver. 6 , which specifies, in the case of the false teachers, the general result of having missed it: ver 7 supplies some additional characteristics. ${ }^{\text {}} \Omega \nu$ refers only to the three preceding genitives, not to $\alpha \alpha^{\alpha} \pi \eta \eta$ also (De W.?): à $\gamma \dot{\pi} \eta \eta$, the principle emanating from them, forms the true aim, and stands in contrast with $\mu a r a .0 \lambda$., the
state consequent on missing them, and the result of fulse aim ; comp. Wiesing. in loc. $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \tau o \chi \dot{\eta} \sigma a \nu \tau \in s$ ] 'having missed their aim at.' This word only occurs again in 1 Tim . vi. $21,2 \mathrm{Tim}$. ii. 18 , in both cases with $\pi \in \rho!$ : in its meaning it is opposed to $\epsilon \dot{\sigma} \sigma \tau 0 \chi \in \hat{\nu} \nu$ (Kypke; comp. тє́ $\lambda o s$, ver. 4), and far from being ill chosen (Schleierm. p. 90), conveys more suitably than á $\mu a \rho \tau o ́ v \tau \in s$, the fact that these teachers had once been in the right direction, but had not kept it;

 Chrys.; see exx. in Kypke, Obs. Vol. If. p. 348 . $\vec{\epsilon} \xi \in \tau \rho \alpha \pi \eta \sigma \alpha \nu]$ 'swerved, turned themselves from ;' 'ॄॄє́клlvav, Hesych.: see ch. v. 15 , vi: 20, 2 Tim . iv. 4, Heb. xii. 13. 'Ектрє́тєбテัal is properly 'a viâ deflectere' (Alberti, Obs. p. 392), the ék referring to the original direction from which they swerved; comp. Joseph. Ant. xiri. 10, 5, $\tau \hat{\eta} s ~ \delta \delta \delta o \hat{v}$ $\hat{\epsilon}^{\kappa} \kappa \tau \rho \in \pi \delta\langle\mu \in \nu \nu$, and simply, ib. Ant. virr. 10. 2, єis ảdínous $\dot{\epsilon} \xi \in \tau \rho a ́ \pi \eta ~ \pi \rho \alpha ́ \xi \epsilon \iota s$. 'Aversi sunt' (Beng.) is thus a more exact transl. than 'conversi sunt' (Vulg.). $\quad \mu \alpha \tau \alpha!o \lambda o \gamma i \alpha \nu]$ 'vaniloquium,' or, in more classical Lat. (Livy, xxxiv. 24, Tac. Ann. 111. 49), 'vaniloquentia,' Beza. This was an especial characteristic of the false teachers (comp. Tit. i. 10, iii. 9), and is more exactly defined in the following verse.
7. ञ่ย่ $\lambda$ o $\nu \tau \in s$ ] 'desiring; they were not really so. This and the following expressions, $\nu 0 \mu о \delta i \delta \dot{\alpha} \sigma \kappa \alpha \lambda o t$, $\mu \grave{\eta}$ עоô̂vt $\kappa$. $\tau . \lambda$., seem distinctly to show, - and this much Schleiermacher (p. 80 sq.) has not failed to perceive, - that Judiaism proper (Leo, compare Theodoret) cannot be the error here assailed. The pouos is certainly the Mosaic law, but, at the same time it was clearly used by the false teachers on grounds essentially

differing from those taken up by the Judaists, and in a way which betrayed their thorough ignorance of its principles; see Huther in loc. The assertion of Baur (Pastoralbriefe, p. 15), that Antinomians (Marcionites, etc.) are here referred to, is opposed to the plain meaning of the words, and the obvious current of the passage ; comp. ver. 8 sq .
$\mu \dot{\eta} \nu 00$ v̂ $\nu \tau \in s$ ] 'yet understanding not, thongh they understand not;' the participle having a slight antithetical or perhaps even concessive force (Donalds. Gr. § 621 : the total want of all qualifications on the part of these teachers is contrasted with their aims and assumptions. The correct translation of participles will always be modified by the context, as it is from this alone that we can infer which of its five possible uses (temporal, causal, modal, concessive, conditional) mainly prevails in the passage before us : for exx. in the New Test. see Winer, Gr. §45. 2, p. 307 (where, however, the uses of the part. are not well-defined), and for exx. in classical Greek, the more satisfactory lists of Krüger, Sprachl. § 56.10 sq. On the negative with the part. comp. notes on ch. vi. 4.
$\left.\mu \dot{\eta} \tau \in \hat{\alpha} \kappa_{0} \tau_{0} \lambda_{\text {. }}\right]$ The negation bifurcates ; the objects to which it applies, and with respect to which the ignorance of the false teachers extends, are stated in two clauses introduced by the adjunctive negatives $\mu \dot{\eta} \tau \epsilon-\mu \dot{\eta} \tau \epsilon$; compare Matth. v. 34, James v. 12, and sce Winer, Gr. § 55. 6, p. 433. Their ignorance was thus complete, it extended alike to the assertions they made and the subjects on which they made them. $\pi \in \rho\} \tau i \nu \omega \nu \quad \delta \iota \alpha \beta \in \beta$.] 'whereof they affirm,' Auth. Ver.' - scil. 'the subject about which (Syr., Vulg.) they make their asseverations;' not 'what they maintain,' Luther; Bretschn., compare De Wette. The compound verb $\delta a \alpha \beta \epsilon-$

Batov̂gतेaı does not here necessarily imply 'contention,' Syr. [contendentes], but, as in Tit. iii. 8, is simply equivalent to $\lambda \epsilon \epsilon \gamma \epsilon t \nu \mu \in \tau \grave{\alpha} \beta \in \beta \alpha t \omega$ $\sigma \in \omega s$ ('stiurjan,' Goth.: comp. Pollux, Onomast v. 152, $\delta \iota \epsilon \gamma \gamma v \omega \hat{\omega} \mu t, \delta 1 \alpha \beta \in \beta$., סü̈ $\chi \cup p i(\rho \mu a \iota), \pi \epsilon \rho\}$ referring to the object about which the action of the verb takes place (Winer, Gr. § 47. e, p. 333); compare Polyb. Hist. xır. 12.
 тov́tcul. Thus then \& and $\pi \epsilon \rho l$ tiv $\omega \nu$ refer to different objects (opp. to De W.) ; the former referring to the subjective assertions, the latter to the objects which called them forth: so Huther, Weisinger. The union of the relative and interrogative in parallel clauses involves no difficulty ; see Wincr, Gr: § 25. 1, p. 152, Bernhardy, Synt. xiri. 11. p 443, and the copious list of exx. cited by Stallbaum on Plato, Crit. p. 48 A .
8. ơ $\delta a \mu \in \nu \delta \epsilon ́]$ 'Now we know; '
 $\delta \bar{\eta} \lambda \delta \nu \nu$ द̇ $\sigma \tau \iota$, Chrys. (on Rom. vii. 14): compare Rom. ii. 2, iii. 19, vii. 14 (Lachm. marg.), viii. 28. The $\delta \in \in$, though certainly not $=\mu \epsilon ́ \nu$ Möller (an unfortunate comment), is still not directly oppositive, but rather $\mu \in \tau a \beta a \tau \iota \kappa \delta \nu$ (in a word, not 'at' but 'autem' Hand, Tursell. Vol. I. p. 562, compare p. 425), and the whole clause involves a species of concession : the false teachers made use of the law ; so far well ; their error lay in their improper use of it ; oủ $\tau \hat{\varphi}$ עóu $\omega$
 $\tau 0 \hat{\nu} \nu \dot{\iota} \mu 0 v$, Theodoret. $k a \lambda$ 'ós] 'good,' morally ; not $\dot{\omega} \phi$ '́ $\lambda \iota \mu o s$, Theodoret, De W. The object of the apostle seems to be a full admission, not merely of the usefulness, but the positive excellence of the law ; compare Rom. vii. 12 , 14,16 . $\quad \delta \nu$ ó $\mu$ os s) 'the law;'


surely not 'law in the abstract' (Pcile), hut, as the preceding expression $\nu 0 \mu \circ \delta \delta^{\prime}$ ठс́бкалоь unmistakeably implies, 'the Mosuic law,' the law which the false teachers improperly used and applied to Christianity. $\tau$ ıs] 'any one,' i. e., as the context seems here to suggest, any teacher; 'non de auditore legis [compare Chrys.] sed de doctore loquitur,' Beng., - and, after him, most recent interpreters. $\quad \nu$ o $\mu$ í $\mu \omega s$ ] 'lawfully,' i. e. agreeably to the design of the law ; an obvious instance of that effective paronomasia (repetition of a similar or similar-sounding word) which we so often observe in St. Paul's Epp.; sce exx. in Winer, Gr. § 68. 1, p. 560 sq. The legitimate use of the law has been very differently defined, e. $g$. ö öa
 Theophyl. ; т̀̀ $\pi \alpha р a \pi \epsilon ́ \mu \pi \epsilon \iota \nu ~ \pi \rho \grave{s} \tau \grave{\nu}$ Xpıoтóv, Chrys. 2, Theodoret, Theoph.;
 ovoias, Chrys. 3, etc. The context, however, seems clearly to limit this legitimate use, not to a use consistent with its nature or spirit in the abstract (Mack, comp. Justiniani), but with the admission of the particular principle $\delta$ öt
 $\kappa . \tau . \lambda$. The false teachers, on the contrary, assumed that it was designed for the righteous man, urged their interpretations of it as necessarary appendices to the Gospel ; so De W., Weissing., al., and, similarly, Alford.
9. Єíb̀s s. रô $\tau$ o] 'knowing this,' 'being aware of (' mit dem Bewusstsein,' Wegsch.) this great truth and principle;' secondary and participial predication, referring, not to the subject of oto $\alpha \mu \epsilon \nu$ (' per enallagen numeri,' Elsner, Obs. Vol. 11. p. 288), but to the foregoing $\tau t s$, and specifying the view which must be taken of the law by the
teacher who desires to rightly ase it. yóros oi $k \in \hat{i} T \alpha /]$ 'the low is not ordamed.' The translation of Peile, 'no law is enacted,' is fairly detensible (see Middleton, Greek Art. p. 385 sq. and comp. III. 3. 5, p. 46, ed. Rose), and not without plausibility ; the absence of the article being regarded as designed to imply that $\nu \delta \mu o s$ is taken indefinitely, and that the sentiment is perfectly gen-
 $\nu \delta \mu o v$, Antiph. ap. Stob. Floril. 1x. 16 [cited by Mack, al.). As, however, it is now certain that עópos, like many similar words both in the N. T. and elsewhere (see the full list in Winer, Gr. §. 19. 1, p. 109 sq.), even when anarthrous, can and commonly does signify 'the Mosaic law' (compare Alford on Rom. ii. 12), and as this sense is both suitable in the present passage, as defining the true functions of the Mosaic law, and is also coincident with St. Paul's general view of its relation to the Christian (comp. Rom. vi. It, Gal. iii. 19, al.) we retain with Chrys. and the Greck expositors the definite reference of $\nu \delta \mu o s: ~ c o m p . ~ I r e n . ~ H c e r . ~ i v . ~ 3: ~$ so De W., Huther, Wiesing., al.
$\delta \iota \kappa \alpha[\omega]$ ' $\alpha$ righteous man.' The exact meaning of סíkatos has been somewhat differently estimated : it would seem not so much, on the one hand, as $\delta \delta$ ıкaı $\omega$ స̀ $\epsilon$ is, with a formal reference to סikaıo. $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \pi i \sigma \tau \epsilon \omega s$, nor yet, on the other, so
 ophyl., but rather, as the context seems to require and imply, 'justus per sanctificationem,' Croc. (compare De W.), he who (in the language of Hooker, Serm. Ir. 7) 'has his measure of fruit in holiness;' compare Waterl. Justif: Vol. 1r. p. $7 . \quad \kappa \in \hat{\imath} \tau \propto \iota]$ ' is enacted,' 'posita est,' Vulg., 'ist satith,' Goth. No special or peculiar force (' onus illud

## 

maledictionis，＇Pisc．；＇consilium et des－ tinatio，＇Kuittn．ap．Peile）is here to be assigned to keío tau，it being only used in its proper and classical sense of ＇enactment，＇etc．，of laws ；comp．（even passively，Jelf，Gr．§ 359．2）Xenoph．
 кєцย＇vous vo $\mu$ оиs，and the numerous exx． in Wetstein，Kypke，and the phrase－ ological annotators．The origin of the phrase scems due to the idea，not of mere local position（＇in publico exponi ilique jacere，＇Kypke，Obs．Vol：in．p． 349），but of＇fixity，＇etc．（comp．Rost． u．Palm，Lex．s．v．12，Vol．．．1694） which is involved in the use of $\kappa \in i \sigma$ îal．
 and unruly．＇．The reference of àvópots and davtoт．to violation of divine and human laws respectively（Leo）is in－ genious，but doubtful．Both imply opposition to law ；the former perhaps， as the derivation seems to convey，a more passive disregard of it ；the latter， as its deriv．also suggests（ $\mathfrak{i n o \tau \alpha ́ \sigma \sigma \epsilon \sigma ה ̊ a \iota ~}$ $=$ sponte submittere，Tittm．Synon．II． p．3）a more active violation of it，aris－ ing from a refractory will；comp．Tit．i． 10，where ảyuтótaктol stands in neal connection with ả้ $\nu \iota \lambda \epsilon$＇́रovтєs．
$\dot{\alpha} \sigma \in \beta \in ́ \sigma \iota \nu \kappa \alpha l \dot{\alpha} \mu \alpha \rho \tau$ ．］＇ungodly and sinful．＇These epithets are also connected in 1 Pet．iv．18，Prov．xi． 31. This second bracket points to want of reverence to God；the third to want of inner purity and holiness；the fourth to want of even the commonest human feeling．The list is closed by an enu－ meration of special vices．$\dot{\alpha} \nu o$－ $\sigma$［ols］＇unholy；＇only here and 2 Tim． iii．2．As ó otots and $\delta \sigma$ tót $\eta \mathrm{s}$ seem，in all the passages where they are used by St．Paul，to convey the notion of a ＇holy purity＇（comp．notes on Eph．iv． 24，and Harless in loc．），the same idea is probably involved in the negative．

The $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \in \beta$ ク̀s is unholy through his lack of reverence；the àvóros through his lack of inner purity．．．The use in classical authors is appy．somewhat dif－ ferent ；it seems there rather to mark ＇impiety＇（Plato，Euthyphr．p． 9 D， 8 à̀ $\pi a ́ \nu t \epsilon s$ oi ง̦єoi $\mu \iota \sigma \hat{\omega} \sigma t \nu, \dot{\alpha} \nu \delta \sigma \iota o \nu)$ ，the vio－ lation of fus in contradistinction to jus， whether in its highest sense in relation to the gods，e．g．Schol．Eurip．Hec．
 sense in relation to parents and kindred， e．g．Xen．Cyrop．viil．8，27，ảvoot $\omega \tau$ ќpous $\pi \in p) \sigma u \gamma \gamma \in \nu \in \hat{\epsilon} s$ ：see Tịtmann，Synon．I． p．25．Hence the frequent combination of àvó⿱宀tos and áóıkos，e．g．Plato，Gorg． p． 505 в，Legy．vi．p． 777 e，Theæt．p． 176 e，Republ．II．，p． 363 d．
$\lambda \psi^{\prime} \alpha$ s］＇smiters of father，＇Mos？
 Syr．；not＇murderers of fathers，＇Auth． Ver．Both the derivation（ả $\lambda o \alpha \alpha^{\prime} \omega$ ，com－ pare Aristoph．Ran．149）and the similar use of the word in good authors（e．g． Demosth．Timocr．732，Aristoph．Nub． 1327，compared with 1331，and esp． Lysias，Theomn．116．8）will certainly warrant this milder translation；comp．
 тaт $\rho a \lambda \hat{\varphi} a s$ ó aủrós，and Poll．Onomast． Iri．13，who even extends it to oi $\pi \in p$ l Toùs foveîs ękauaptávovtes ：sim．Hesych．，
 ओे $\kappa \tau \epsilon i \nu \omega \nu$ ．It seems，too，more consis－ tent with the context，as the crime of parricide or matricide would naturally be comparatively rare，and almost（even in a pagan＇s idea，compare Ciccro，pro Rosc．c．25）out of the special contem－ plation of any law．Against the crime of the text the Mosaic law had made a provision，Exodus xxi． 15 （obs．there is no addition ress ，as in ver．12），comp． Lev．xx．9．The following duvסिoфóvots
supplies no argument against this transl． （De W．）；St．Paul is obviously follow－ ing the order of the commandments． The usual Attic form is marpa入oías； Thom．Mag．p． 695 （ed．Bern．），Alberti， Obs．p． 394.
10．ג̀ $\nu \delta \rho \alpha \pi \pi o \delta i \sigma \tau a \hat{\imath ิ s] ~ ' m e n-s t e n t-~}$ ers ：＇＇plagiariis＇（Cicero，Quint．Frat． I．2．2），i．e．＇qui vel fraude vel apertâ vi homines suffurantur ut pro manci－ piis vendant，＇＇Vorst ap．Pol．Synion．； compare Poll．Onomast．iII．78，àvopat．

 a repulsive and exaggerated violation of the eighth commandment，as àpotvorot－ $\tau$ eiv is similarly of the seventh：they are grouped with $\delta \rho a \pi \epsilon \epsilon a l$ and $\mu 01 \chi o i$, ，Polyb． Ifist．xir．9．2，10．6；compare Rein， Criminalrecht，p． 386 sq．The penalty of death is attached to this crime，Exo－ dus xxi．16，Deut．xxiv． 7 ；so appy．in some Pagan codes，Xenoph．Laced．iv． 36 ；see Sturz．，Lex．Xenoph．s．v．
द̀ $\pi$ เópкots］＇perjured persons，＇Auth． Ver．：＇$\grave{\text { étópкot sunt et ii qui quod }}$ juraverunt non faciunt（Xenoph．Agesil． 1．12，comp．11）et ii qui quod falsum esse norunt jurato affirmant．＇Raphel． Perjury is specially mentioned Lev．xix． 12.
 $\tau_{t}$（Mack），but is a mere emphatic and inclusive form of expression．It implics that all forms of sinfulness had not been specifically mentioned，but that all are designed to be included；Raphael（Obs． Vol．i1．p．562）very appositely cites Polyb．Hist．p， 983 ［xv．18．5］，oiklas
 Maб

т $\hat{\eta}$ íviatyoúan
$\delta เ \delta \alpha \sigma \kappa$ ．］＇the sound（healthful－not healthgiving，Mosh．）doctrine：＇ка入̄ิs

 Chrys．；comp．Plutarch，de Liber．Educ．


סéas，ib．§ 7 ，íraívoutos kal tefay ${ }^{\text {évov }}$ Biov．The formula is nearly identical in meaning with $\hat{\eta}$ кa入̀̀ $\delta \delta \delta a \sigma \kappa a \lambda\{a$ ，ch． iv． 6 ，and $\dot{\eta} \kappa a \tau^{\prime} \epsilon \dot{\jmath} \sigma \in \in \beta \in l a \nu \quad \delta i \delta a \sigma k$ ．，ch． vi． 3 ，and stands in clear and suggestive contrast to the sickly（ch．vi．4）and morbid（2 Tim．ii．17）teaching of Jewr－ ish gnosis．The present part．secms to convey the idea of present，existing healthiness，which was to be maintained and not depraved ；comp．Waterl．Trin－ ity，Vol．nir．p． $400 . \quad$ The expres－ sions íruaívoura $\delta$ iбarkaría， 2 Tim．iv． 3，Tit．i．9，ii． 1 ，and úrıaivoutes $\lambda$ órot， 1 Tim．vi．3， 2 Tim．i． 13 （compare Tit． ii．8），are peculiar to the Pastoral Epis－ tles，and have frequently been urged as ＇un－Pauline：＇to this the answer of Weisinger（on Tit．i．9）seems fair and satisfactory，－viz．that it is idle to lay stress upon such an usage，unless at the same time corresponding expressions ean be produced out of St．Paul＇s other Epp．，which might suitably take the place of the present：see in answer to Schleiermacher，Planck，Bemerkungen， Gott．1808，Beckhaus，Specimen Obss． Ling．1810．The majority of these objections are really fundamentally un－ critical．If in these Epp．the Apostle is characterizing a different form of error firom any which he had previously described，and if the expressions he has made use of admirably and felicitously depict it，why we are to regard them with suspicion because they do not occur in other Epp．where really dissimilar errors are described？That there is．a certain difference in the language of these Epp．we freely admit，yet still it is not one whit more than is natural to ex－ pect from the form of errors descrileed （see Huther，Einleit p．52），the date of the composition（see notes on ver．3），and， possibly，the age and experiences of the inspired author；compare Guerike，Ein－



I thank Him who entrusted that Gospel to me, and who was merciful to me in my ignorance and unbelief: to Him be all honor and glory
leit. § 48. 2, p. 402 (ed. 2). It is to be regretted that so able a writer as Reuss should still feel difficulties about the authorship of this Ep.; see his Gesch. des N. T. § 90, p. 76.
11. $\kappa \alpha \tau \grave{\alpha} \tau 0 \in \dot{v} \alpha \gamma \gamma \in \lambda_{10 \nu}$ ' $a c-$ cording to the Gospel;' specification of that with which all the foregoing is in accordance. There is some little difficulty in the connection. Three constructions have been proposed: the clause has been connected ( $a$ ) with $\tau \eta$ í $\gamma$. ઠıбабк., Beng., Leo, Peile, al. ; (b) with ä̀tiкeıтal, Mack, Matth., compare Justin. 2; (c) with the whole foregoing sentence, ver. 9 sq., De W., Huther, Wiesing. Of these (a) seems clearly grammatically untenable: for the article [inserted in $\mathrm{D}^{1}$; Bas.] cannot be dispensed with, as Theopyl., in his gloss, $\tau \hat{̣}$ ov̆v Again (b) is exegetically unsatisfactory, as the sentence would thus be tautologous, the $\dot{v} \gamma$. $\delta \iota \delta a \sigma \kappa$. being obviously the import of the $\epsilon \dot{v} a \gamma \gamma^{\prime} \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{\text {. }}$. it not even synonomous with it ; comp. ch. vi. 1, 3. Thus then (c) is alone tenable: the Apostle substantiates his positions about the law and its application by a reference to the Gospel. His present assertions were coincident with its teaching and principles : so, very similarly, Rom. ii. 16 ; sec Meyer, in loc., and on katá, comp. notes on Eph i. 5 . $\tau \hat{\eta} s$ $\delta \delta \xi \eta \mathrm{s}]$ is not a mere genitive of quality (compare Winer, Gr. § 34. 2. b, p. 211), and only equivalent to eैvōogos, Beza. Auth. Ver., al., but is the gen. of the contents; sce Bernhardy, Synt. III. 44, p. 161, Scheuerl. Synt. § $17: 1$, p. 126, and notes on Eph. i. 13, and compare 2 Cor. iv. 4. The glory of God, whether as evinced in the sufferings of Christ
(Chrys) or in the riches of His sovereign grace, (D. W.), is the import, that which is contained in, and revealed by the Gospel, 'quod. Dei majestatem et immensam gloriam [Rom. ix. 23, Eph. iii. 16] explicet,' Justiniani, 2. The gen. тov̂ $\hat{\imath} \in 0 \hat{v}$ is consequently not the gen.
 tat, Theodoret, comp. also Chrys.), but the simple possessive genitive, the glory which essentially belongs to and is inmanent in God.
$\mu \alpha \kappa \alpha \rho\{o u]$ This epithet (only here and ch. vi. 15), when thus applied to God, seems designed still more to exalt the glory of the Gospel dispensation. Mákúpıos, indecd, was God, not only on account of His own immutable and essential perfections (ös є̇ $\sigma \tau \iota \nu$ аùтоцакарı́亍тทs, Theophyl. in 1 Tim. vi. 15), but on account of the riches of His mercy in this dispensation to man; comp. Greg. Nyss, in Psalm. i. 1, Vol. I. p. 258 (ed.

 тat: compare also Suicer, Thesaur. Vol. Ir. p. 289. ל̀ $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \tau \in \dot{v} \hat{\imath} \eta \nu\rceil$ ' with which I was entrusted:' a common construction in St. Paul's Epp., especially in reference to this subject ; see 1 Cor. ix. 17, Gal. ii. 7, 1 Thess. ii. 4, Tit. i.3. As the context is simply referring to the past, not (as in Gal ii. 7) also to the present fact of the apostle's commission, the aor is perfectly, suitable; see notes on Gal. ii. 7 .
12. $\chi$ ๙́ $\rho เ \nu$ モ้ $\chi \omega$ ] 'And I give thanks ;' appended paragraph (not howerer, as Alf, only with a comma after є่ $\begin{gathered}\omega \\ ) \\ \text { ex- }\end{gathered}$ pressive of the Apostle's profound thankfulness for God's mercy toward him, as implied in the $\delta \dot{\epsilon} \pi \in \sigma \tau \epsilon \dot{v}\langle\eta \nu$ of the preceding verse. It has been urged

## 

12. ral $\chi$ d́pıv ${ }^{\prime} \chi \chi \omega$ ] So Tisch. (ed. 2, 7) with D K L; great majority of mss.; Clarom., Goth., Syr. (hoth), al. ; Dam., Ecum. (text) ; Lucif., Ambrst. (Rec., Griesb., Sholz, Wiesing.). The connecting kal is omitted in AFG; about 10 mss. ; Boern., Vulg., Copt., 衤th. (both), Arm.; Chrys., Theodoret, al.; Pel., Vig., Berl. (Mill, Prolegom. p. Lxxxiv., Lachm., Huther, De Wrtle (e sil.), Tiseh. ed. 1, A/f.). The external authorities are thus nearly equally balanced. Intermal arguments are also nearly in equipoise : - if, on the one hand, the important critical principle, 'proclivi lectioni prestat ardua' (compare Tregelles, Printed Tert of N. T., p. 221), seems here to find a legitimate application, the insertion of kaí, on the other hand, is distinctly in accordance with St. Paul's use of that particle. As it is possible that the omission of kai may have arisen from a mistaken idea of the connection of èỳे with $\chi$ d́pev Є̌ $\chi \omega$, and as the preponderance of external evidence is perhaps slightly in favor of the insertion, we retain, though not with perfect confidence, the reading of Tischendorf.
by Schleierm. (p. 163 sq.) in his arguments against the genuineness of this Ep., that there is here a total want of connection. Were it even so, no argument could be fairly founded on it, for what is more noticeable than St. Paul's tendency to digression whenever anything connected with his mission and the mercy of God towards him comes before his thoughts? comp. 1 Cor. xv . 9 sq., Eph. iii. 8. There is, however, here scarcely any digression; the Apostle pauses on the weighty words $\hat{\delta}$ émıo-
 norance and uncertainty of the false teachers, ver. 7 !), to express with deep humility (compare Chrys.) his thankfulness; with this thankfulness he interweaves, ver. 13 sq., a demonstration, founded on his own experiences of the transforming grace of the Gospel, and the forgiveness (not the legal punishment) of $\sin$. Thus, without sceking to pursue the subject in the form of a studied contrast between the law and the Gospel (he was not now writing against direct Judaizers) or of a declaration how the transgressors of the law were to attain righteousness (see Baumgarten, Pastoralbr. p. 224 sq.), he more than implies it all in the history of his
own case. In a word, the law was for the condemnation of sinners ; the Gospel of Jesus Christ was for the saving of sinners and the ministration of forgiveness: verily it was an єủaryé入ıoע тท̂s
 in loc. $\quad \tau \hat{\varphi} \epsilon \nu \delta v \nu a \mu \omega \sigma \alpha \nu \tau i]$ 'to him who strengthened me within,' sc. for the discharge of my commission, for bearing the $\lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha} \beta o u \rho o \nu(C h r y s) ~ o f ~ C h r i s t .$. The expressive word èvouva $\mu$., with the exception of Acts ix. 22, is only found in the N. T. in St. Paul's Epp. (Rom. iv. 20, Eph. vi. 10, Phil. iv. 13, 2 Tim. ii. 1, iv. 17) and Heb. xi. 34 : compare notes on Eph. vi. 10. There does not seem any reference to the $\delta v \nu \dot{a} \mu \in t s$ which attested the apostleship (Macknight), nor specially to mere bravery in confronting dangers (compare Chrys.), but generally to spiritual $\delta \dot{v} v a \mu s$, for the functions of his apostleship.
$\pi \iota \sigma \tau o \delta \nu]$ 'faithful,' 'trusty;' compare 1 Cor. vii. 25. . Eadic, on Eph. 1. 1, p. 4, advocates the participial translation 'believing' (compare Goth. 'galáubjandan ') : this, however, seems here clearly untenable; the addition of the words eis סıaкoviav show that the word is used in its ordinary ethical, not theological sense. શ̇є́ $\mu \in \nu$ оs єis $\delta \iota \alpha \kappa$.] 'appointing me,


or，in that he appointed me，for the minis－ try；＇not＇postquam，＇Grot．，but＇dum
 cis $\delta$ stak．，furnished proof and evidence

 ophyl．；see Winer，Gr．§ 45．4，p． 311. Schleiermacher takes exception at this expression；why may we not adduce 1 Thess．v．9，єैजैєтo $\grave{\eta} \mu$ âs єis ỏp $\gamma_{n} \nu$ ？

13．名 $\nu \tau$ a］The participle scems here to involve a concessive meaning，＇though I was，＇＇cum tamen essem，＇Justiniani， －certainly not，＇who was，＇Alf，as this gives it a predicative character．On the use of participles in concessive sentences， see Donaldson，Gr．§ 621，and compare notes on ver．7．$\left.\quad \beta \lambda \alpha \alpha^{\alpha} \sigma \phi \eta \mu o \nu\right]$ ＇blasphemer；＇in the full and usually received meaning of the word，as it was specially against the name of our Lord （Acts xxvi．9，11）that St．Paul both spoke and acted．The verb $\beta \lambda a \sigma \phi \eta \mu \epsilon i \nu$ （i．e．$\beta \lambda \alpha \psi \iota \emptyset \mu \epsilon i \nu$, Pott，Etym．Forsch． Vol．r．p．47，Vol．Ir．p．49）taken per se is nearly equivalent in meaning to入oıठopeĩ（e．g．Murlyr．Polyc．9，入oı $\delta \dot{o}^{-}$ рクбоу т $\delta \nu \mathrm{X}$ рıбто́，compared with the martyr＇s answer，$\pi \omega \hat{s} \delta \dot{v} \nu \alpha \mu a \iota ~ \beta \lambda \alpha \sigma \phi \eta \mu \hat{\eta}-$ $\sigma a l$ ；compare Clem．Alex．Paedag．1．8， p．137，ed．Potter），but when in connec－ tion with God＇s name it naturally has the more special and frightful meaning
 see Suicer，Thesrur．s．v．Vol．1．p． 696 sq．$\delta \iota \omega \kappa \tau \eta \nu$ ］＇persecutor；＇où

 see Acts xxii．4，Gal．i．13， 23.
i $\beta \rho เ \sigma \tau$ ทं $\nu$ ］＇doer of outrage，＇Conyb and Hows．；only here and Rom．i． 30 ；$\dot{\text { ißpto－}}$ テ̀̀s［perhaps from ún $\epsilon$ ，Donald．Cratyl． § 335 ，with verbal root，$i$＇（ire），Pott， Etym．Forsch．Vol．1．p．144］is one who displays his insolence not in words
merely，but in deeds of violence and outrage：see Trench，Synon．§ xixix． ＇Paulus nequitiam quibusdam veluti gradibus amplificat．Primus gradus est maledicere，ideo se vocat blasphe－ mum ；secuudus insectari，ideo se appel－ lat persecutorem ；et quia potest insec－ tatio citra vim consistere，addit tertio se fuisse oppressorem，＇Justiniani．The translation of the Vulgate＇contumeli－ osus，＇is scarcely critically exact，as， although＇contumelia＇［perhaps from ＇contumeo，＇Voss，Etymol．s．v．，comp． Pott，Vol．1．p．51］is frequently ap－ plied to deeds（e．g．Cæsar，Bell．Gall．， quamvis vim et contumeliam［fluctuum］ perferre），＇contumeliosus，＇scems more commonly applied to words．The dis－ tinction between intepŕфavos（thoughts），
 is investigated in Trench，l．c．；see also Tittm．Synon．I 74．$\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha} \hat{\eta} \lambda \in \eta^{-}$ N $\eta \nu]$＇still，notwithstanding，$I$ obtainerl mercy．＇＇A $A \lambda \alpha$ has here its full and proper seclusive（＇aliud jam hoc esse，de quo sumus dicturi，＇Klotz，Devar．Vol． II．p．2），and thence commonly adversa－ tive force：God＇s mercy and St．Pauls＇ want of it are put in sharpest contrast． In the following words the apostle clearly does not seek simply to excuse himself （De W．），but to illustrate the merciful procedure of divine grace．His igno－ rance did not give him any claim on God＇s è $\lambda \in o s$ ，but merely put him within the pale of its operation．$\epsilon \nu$ à $\pi \iota \sigma \tau$ ía（＇being yet in unbelieff，＇Peile） then further defines the ground of his äryout：his ignorance was due to his àmıбтía．How far that àmıatía was ex－ cusable，is，as Huther observes，left un－ noticed：it is only implied that the árpoia which resulted from it was such as did not leave him wholly d̀varo入ó $\eta$－


##  

 Theodoret: comp. Acts iii. 17, Rom. x. 2, and see esp. the excellent sermon of Waterland, Part 11.. Vol. v. p. 731.
14. $\dot{v} \pi \in \rho \in \pi \lambda \in$ ó $\nu a \sigma \in \nu$ ] 'wus (not 'huth been,' Peile) exceeding abundant,'
$\Lambda^{\circ} \hat{\infty}$ [magna fuit] Syr.; compare

 There is not here any comparative force in $\dot{v} \pi \epsilon \rho \in \pi \lambda \epsilon \dot{\delta} \nu \alpha \sigma \epsilon \nu$, whether in relation to the apostle's former sin and unbelief (Mack), or to the èncos which he had
 $\delta \omega \bar{p} a$, Chrys.), as verbs compounded with úrép are used by St. Paul in a superl. rather than a compar. sense; see Fritz. Rom. Vol. I. p. 350 ; the apostle thus only explains more fully how, and in what measure, he obtained mercy. This, it may be observed, he introduces, not by an explanatory ка́, or a confirmatory $\gamma$ d́ $\rho$, but by $\delta \epsilon$; a gentle adversative force being suggested by the last words, ėv àmıбтíą: 'yes, unbelieving I was, but God's grace was not on that account given in scanty measure:' see especially Klotz, Devur. p. 363 sq , and comp. the remarks in notes on Gal. iii. 8, 11, and al. pass. The word $\dot{i} \pi \epsilon \rho \pi \lambda$. is excessively rare ; it has at present only been found in the Psalt. Salom. v. 19, and Hermæ Fragmenta, ap. Fabric. Bibl. Gr. Book v. 1, Vol. v. p. 12 (cd. 1712), where it is used with a semi-local reference, - ổ $\chi \omega \rho \in \hat{\imath}$ ékeîvo
 Paul's frequent use of verbs compounded with $v \pi \pi \epsilon$, see notes on Eph. iii. 20. $\mu \in \tau \grave{\alpha} \pi\{\sigma \tau, \kappa \alpha \ell \grave{\alpha} \gamma$. Faith and love are 'the concommitunts of the grace of our Lord Jesus ; ' on which proper force of $\mu \in \tau \alpha$, sce notes on $E p h$. vi. 23, and compare ib. iv. 2. Leo has rightly felt and expressed this use of the
prep., - 'verbis $\mu \in \tau \grave{\alpha}$ к. $\tau$. $\lambda$. indicatur $\pi\{\sigma \tau, \kappa . \grave{a} \gamma$. quasi comites fuisse illius xápitos.' Of the two substantives the first $\pi i \sigma \tau / 5$ stands in obvious antithesis to èv $\dot{a} \pi เ \sigma \tau i ́ a$, , ver. 13 (on its more inclusive sense as also implying è $\lambda \pi i$ is, sce Usteri, Lehrb. 11. 1. 4, p. 241), while à $a^{\prime} \pi \eta$, which here seems clearly to imply Christian love, love to man (Justin.) as well as to God, suggests a contrast to his former cruelty and hatred; 'dilectio in Christo opponitur sævitiæ quam exercuerat adversus fideles, Calv.
$\tau \hat{\eta} s$ 'ev $\quad \mathrm{X} \rho$.$] 'which is in Christ,' -$ not 'per Christum,' Justin. (compare Chrys., $\tau \delta, \epsilon_{\epsilon} \nu, \delta \iota \alpha{ }^{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \iota \nu$ ), but in Him, as its true sphere and element. Faith and love have their only true centre in Jesus Christ; it is ouly when we are in union with Him that we can share in and be endowed with those graces. This proper meaning of $\epsilon^{2} \nu$ has frequently been vindicated in these commentaries ; see notes on Gul. ii. 17, on Eph. i. 2, al. On the insertion of the article, see notes on ch. iii. 13.
15. $\pi \iota \sigma \tau$ ds ò $\lambda \delta \boldsymbol{\gamma} \circ \mathrm{s}$ ] 'Faithful is the saying,' 'triggv [trusty, sure] thata vaurd,' Goth. ; $\pi เ \sigma \tau \not ́ s$ - à $\nu \tau \ell$ тồ ă $\psi \in \dot{v}-$ $\delta \eta s$ кal $ఓ \lambda \eta$ n'ท's, Theod. This 'gravissima præfandi formula' (Beng.), is found only in the Pastoral Epp.; ch. iii. 1, iv. 9, 2 Tim. ii. 11, 'Tit. iii. 8 ; comp. the somewhat similar forms, oûtot

 x. 6, 2 Chron. ix. 5. This is one of the many hints that may tend to confirm us in the opinion that the thrce Epp. were written about the same time; compare Gucrike, Einleit. § 48.1, p. 400 (ed. 2). $\pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \sigma \eta s \dot{\alpha} \pi o \delta o \chi \hat{\eta} s$ ] 'all (i.c. every kind of) acceptation,' Auth. Ver. ; an excellent translation. 'A $\pi 0 \delta o \chi$ ń, 'exceptio studii et favoris plena,' Schweigh. Lex.



Polyb. s. v. (comp. àmoঠєктós, ch. ii. 3, v. 4), is used very frequently and in very similar constructions by later Greek writers ; e. g. à $\pi$ od. ą̧ıos, Philo, de Præm. § 23, Vol. 1. p. 565, ib. de Profuy. § 2, Vol. 11. p. 410, al. In Polybius (where it very frequently occurs), it is occasionally found in union with míctis, e. g. Hist. 1. 43. 4, vi. 2. 13,-'etiam fides species est acceptionis,' Beng.; see the collections of Elsner and the phrascolog. annotators, by all of whom the word is abundantly illustrated. On this use of mâs with abstract nouns, commonly denoting ertension ('omnium totius animi facultatum,' Beng.) rather than intension, see notes on Eph. i. 8.
$\hat{\jmath} \lambda \hat{\lambda} \in \nu \in$ is $\tau \delta \nu \kappa \delta \sigma \mu o \nu$ ] 'came into the world:' see John xvi. 28, and (according to the most probable construction) ib. i. 9. In these passages $\kappa \delta \sigma \mu$ os is appy. used in its physical or perhaps rather (see John iii. 16 sq .) collective sense ; comp. Reuss, Theol. Chret. iv. 20, p. 228, and notes on Gal. iv. 3. The allusion they involve to the $\pi \rho o u ̈ \pi a p \xi$ ts of Christ is clear and unmistakable ; comp. Pearson, Creed, Vol. 1. p. 141 (ed. Burton). $\hat{\dot{\omega} \nu} \pi \rho \bar{\omega} \tau$ ós $\in i \mu l]$ 'of whom I am chief;' 'antecedens omnes non tempore sed magnitudine,' August. in Psalm lxx. Justiniani and others, following a hint of Ambrose, endeavor to qualify these words, by referring the relative, not to $\dot{\alpha} \mu \alpha \rho \tau \omega \lambda o u s ~ a b-~$ solutely, but 'iis tantum qui ex Judaismo
 $\dot{\nu} \omega \nu$, Wegscheid. : similarly Mack, and, what is more singular, Waterland, Serm. xxx. Vol. v. p. 729. As however the
 clearly be taken in their widest extent,'non solos illos Judæos sed et omnes omnino homines et peccatores venit salvos facere,' Corn. a Lap., - any interpre-
tation which would limit either $\dot{a} \mu a \rho \tau \omega-$入oùs or its relative seems exegetically untenable. Equally unsuccessful is any grammatical argument deduced from the anarthrous $\pi \rho \omega \hat{T}$ os, scil. ' ciner der Vornelmsten.' Flatt ; for comp. Matth. x. 2 (De Wette also cites ib. xxii. 38 , but the reading is doubtful, and Middleton, Art., vi. 3, p. 100 (ed.Rose). Thus to explain away the force of this expression is seriously to miss the strong current of feeling with which, even in terms of seeming hyperbole ( $\alpha u ̈ \div \grave{\tau} \nu$ vincpßaivet $\tau \eta ิ s ~ \tau a \pi \epsilon เ \nu o-$ фpoovivns öpov, Theod.) the apostle ever alludes to his conversion, and his state preceding it; see notes on Eph. iii. 8. $\epsilon i \mu t]$ Not $\hat{\eta} \nu$; 'cave existimes modestiæ causâ apostolum mentitum esse. Veram enim non minus quam humilem confessionem edere voluit, atque ex intimo cordis sensu depromptam,' Calvin. Sce the excellent sermons on this text by Hammond, Serm. xxx. xxxı. p. 632 sq. (A. C. Libr,), and compare August. Serm. clxxiv. clxxv. Vol. v. p. 939 sq. (ed. Migne), Frank, Serm. viII. Vol. 1. p. 108 sq. (A. C. L.).
16. ả $\lambda \lambda \alpha ́]$ 'Howbeit,' Auth. Ver., not resumptive (' respicit ad ver. 13 ,' Heinr.), but, as in ver. 13, seclusive and antithetical, marking the contrast between the apostle's own judgment on himself and the mercy which God was pleased to show him: á $\mu a \rho \tau \omega \lambda$ ós ( $\mu$ è $\nu$ )
 ciously changed 'sed,' Vulgate, into 'verum;' see Klotz, Devar. Vol. II. p. 3, and compare some remarks of Waterland on this particle, Serm. v. (Moyer's Lect.), Vol. II. p. 108.
$\delta \iota \grave{\alpha} \tau 0 \hat{v} \tau 0$ ] 'on this account,' 'for this end;' pointing to, and directing more especial attention to the iva.
$\epsilon^{\prime} \nu \quad \dot{\epsilon} \mu \mathrm{o}[]$ 'in me;' not equiv. to $\delta \iota^{\circ}$ ${ }_{\epsilon}{ }^{\prime} \mu 0 \hat{u}$ (Theod.), but with the usual and

## 

full force of the prep.; the apostle was to be as it were the substratum of the action : comp. Exod. ix. 16, and see exx. in Winer, G'r. § 48, a, p. 345, and notes on Giul. i. 24. $\quad \pi \rho \dot{\omega} \tau \omega]$ ' the chief;' not 'first,' Auth. Ver.: 'alludit ad id quod nuper dixerat se primum esse inter peccatores,' Calv.
$\epsilon^{2} \nu \delta \in\{\xi \eta \tau \alpha l]$ 'might show forth;' intensive, or, as it has been termed, dynamic middle; comp. Donalds. Gr. §432, 2. $b 6$, Krüger; Sprachl. § 52. 8, and notes on Eph. ii. 7, where this word and its uses are noticed and investigated.
$\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha \sigma \alpha \nu \mu \alpha \kappa \rho$.] 'the whole of His long-suffering;' i. e. 'the fulness of longsuffering,' Peile; oủk єै $\phi \eta$, ఫva द้̇ $\nu \delta$. द̇ $\nu$

 É $\chi \in \iota$ цакроی̀u $\bar{\jmath} \sigma a t$, Chrys. The reading äтaбay (Lachm., Tisch.) is not quite certain: the preponderance of uncial authority [AFG opp. to DIKL] is perhaps slightly in its favor, but it may be remarked that the form ätas is only found once more in St. Paul's Epp., Eph. vi. 13 (Gal, iii. 28 Lachm. is very doubtful), while the more common form occurs about 420 times. St. Luke :uses äras far more ( 23 times certain) than any other of the sacred writers. On the less usual position of the article, see notes on Gal. v. 14, and comp. Gersdorf, Beiträge, p. 381, who has, however, omitted this instance and Acts xx. 18 : comp. Green, Grami. p. 194.

We need not
here modify the meaning of цакроэ.: ' Deo tribuitur $\mu$ aкрoה̆. quia ponas peccatis debitas differt propter gloriam suatm, et ut detur peccatoribus resipiscendi locus,' Suicer, Thesaur. s. v. Vol. ir. p. 293. The distinction of Theophyl. (on Gal. v. 22) between $\mu$ кккроэ̀vцía ( $\tau \delta$
 and $\pi \rho a \dot{o} \tau \eta s$ ( $\tau \grave{\partial}$ ảфı'є́val $\pi \alpha \nu \tau \alpha \dot{\pi} \alpha \sigma \iota$ ) cited by Suicer; s. v., and Trench, Synon. p.

199, may perhaps be substantiated by comparing this passage with Tit. ii. 2. $\pi \rho$ òs $\dot{v} \pi 0 \tau \dot{v} \pi \omega \sigma \iota \nu \kappa . \tau . \lambda$.$] 'to ex-$ hibit a pattern for them, etc.,' $\pi \rho \grave{s}$ àmó-
 [ostensio, exemplum, 2 Pet. ii. 6]. Syr., is a $\delta$ ls $\lambda \in \gamma \delta \mu$. ; here, and in a somewhat modified sense, 2 Tim. i. 13. St. Paul's more usual expression is tútros (Rom. v. 14 , vi. 17,1 Cor. $\mathrm{x} .6,11$, Phil. iii. 17 , al ), but for this $\dot{\pi} \pi o \tau$. is perhaps here substituted, as it is not so much the mere passive example ( $\tau$ úrov) as the active display of it on the part of God ('ad exprimendum exemplar,' Erasm.) which the apostle wishes to specify. The usual explanation that the apostle himself was to be the $\dot{v} \pi \delta \delta \delta e \iota \gamma \mu a$ (2 Pet. ii. 6), the standing type and representative, the 'all-embracing example' (Möller) of those who were hereafter to believe on Christ ('si credis, ut Paulus ; salvabere ut Paulus,' Beng.), is scarcely satisfactory. It was not so much the apostle as the $\mu$ aкpos. shown to him that was the object of the íтотv́r.; comp. Wiesing: in loc. On the technical meaning [adumbratio et institutio brevis) sce the notes of Fabricius on Sext. Empir. p. 1, and Suicer, Thesaur. s. v. Vol. is p. 1398. The gen. $\tau \omega \bar{\nu} \mu \in \lambda \lambda \delta \nu \tau \omega \nu$ (‘in respect of,' 'pertaining to,' see Donalds. $G r . \S 453$ ) may be more specifically defined as the genitive of the point of view (Scheuerl. Synt. § 18, p. 129), or perhaps, more correctly, as an extended application of the possessive gen. ; the ímoтún$\omega \sigma$ ts was designed in reference to them, to be, as it were, their property; so 2 Pet. ii. 6 ; comp. Soph. EEd. Col. 355, and see Scheuerl. Synt. § 13. 2, p. 112 sq., Matth. Gram. § 343. 1 (not 2, where Soph. l. c. is misinterpreted, sce Wunder in loc.). If the dative had been used, the idea of the 'convenience,' 'ben-


efit' of the parties concerned, would have come more prominently into notice : contrast Ecelus. xliv. 16 with 2 P'ct. l.c. The explanation of Bretsch., 'ut (hoc inco exemplo) adumbraret conversionem futuram gentium,' is grammatically defensible but not exegetically satisfactory. $\pi t \sigma \tau \in \dot{v} \in \Delta \nu \quad$ '̇ $\pi$. aù $\tau \hat{\varphi}]$ ' to believe on Him.' In this construction, which only occurs elscwhere in Luke xxiv. 25 (omitted by Huther) and (in one and the same citation from the LXX) Rom. ix. 33, x: 11, 1 Peter ii. 6 (Matthew xxvii. 42 is doubtful), Christ is represented as the busis, foundation, on which faith rests; ${ }^{6} \pi$ l with' dat. marking 'absolute superposition' (Donalds. G'r. § 483), and thence the accessory notion of 'dependence on ;' see Bernhardy, Synt. v. 24, p. 250, Krüger, Sprachl. § 68. 41, p. 541. If we adopt the usual reading and explanation in Mark i: 15 (comp. Jolin iii. 15 [Tisch., Lachm. marg.], Gal. iii. 26, Jerem. xii. 6, Ignat. Philad. 8), it may be observed that $\pi \iota \sigma \tau \subset v ́ \omega$ has five constructions in the N. T., (a) with simple dative; (b)
 dat.; (e) with $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \boldsymbol{l}$ and accus. Of these it scems clear that the prepositional constructions have a fuller and more special force than the simple dative (see Winer, Gr. §31. 2. obs.; p. 241), and also that they all involve different shades of meaning. There may be no great difference in a dogmatical point of view (compare Pearson, Creed, Vol. in. p. 8, ed. Burt.), still the grammatical distinctions seem clearly marked. In a word, the excreise of faith is contemplated under different aspects: (a) expresses only the simple act; (b) involves also the idea of union with; (c) union with, appy, of a fuller and more mystical nature (comp, notes on Gal. iii. 27), with probably some accessory idea of moral motion, mental
direction toward; see Winer, Gr. § 53. a. p. 473 ; (d) reposo, reliance on; (e) mental direction with a view to it; Fritz. Rom. iv. 5, Vol. I. p. 217, comp. Donalds. Gr. $\$ 483$. Of the four latter formulæ, it may be remarked in couclusion, that $(b)$ and $(d)$ aro of rare occurrence ; (c) only (John iii. 15 is doubtful) is used by St. John and St. Peter, by the former very frequently; and about equally with (e) by St. Luke, and rather more than equally by St. Paul : a notice of these constructions will be found in Reuss, Theol. Chret. rv. 14, p. 229 ; compare also Tholuck, Beiträge, p. 94 sq. $\epsilon$ is $\zeta \omega \grave{\eta} \nu$ ai í $\nu$ ıo $\bar{\nu}$ ] 'unto cternal life;' object to which the exercise of $\pi i \sigma \tau \iota s \in \epsilon^{\prime}{ }^{\prime}$ auj $\tau \hat{\omega}$ was directed. It is singular that Bengel should have paused to notice that this clause can be joined with úmovíverav: such a construction has nothing to recommend it.
17. $\beta \alpha \sigma \iota \lambda \in \hat{i} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \alpha i \omega \nu \omega \nu]$ 'to the king of the ages,' isos ${ }^{\circ}$ ? Lices [regi sæculorum] Syriac,-a noticeable title, that must not be diluted into 'the king eternal' of Luth. and the Auth. Ver., even if Hebraistic usage (comp. Winer, Gr. § 34. b, p. 211) may render such a dilution grammatically admissible : comp. Heb. i. 2, xi. 3. The term ai$\omega \bar{\nu} \epsilon \mathrm{s}$ seems to denote, not 'the worlds' in the usual concrete meaning of the term (Chrys., and appy. Theod., Theoph:), but, in accordance with the more usual temporal meaning of aiav in the N. T., ' the ages,' the temporal periods whose sum and aggregation (aī̀ves ' $\bar{\omega} \nu$ ai $\omega \nu \omega \nu$ ) adumbrate the conception of eternity; see notes on Ephl. i. 21. The $\beta \alpha \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon \nu े \tau^{\prime} \omega \bar{\omega}$ ai $\omega \nu \omega \nu$, will thus be 'the sovereign dispenser and disposer of the ages of the world:' sce Psalm exlvi. (cxlv.) 13, ŋ̀ $\beta \alpha \sigma \iota \lambda e i ́ a ~ \sigma o v ~ \beta a \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon i ́ \alpha ~ \pi \alpha ́ \nu-~$



 $\pi \alpha ́ \sigma \eta \gamma^{\prime} \nu \in \tilde{a}, k a i l \gamma \in \nu \epsilon \bar{q}$ and comp. Ex. xv. 18; so IIamm. 1, comp. Usteri, Lehrb. II. 2. 4, p. 315. Any reference to the Gnostic rons (Hamm. 2) is untenable, and completely out of place in this sublime doxology. The title does not occur again in the N. T., but is found in the O.T., Tobit xiii. 6, 10 ; comp. Ecclus. xxxvi. 17. $\delta$ సेє̀ेs $\tau \bar{\omega} \nu$ aí $\omega \nu \omega \nu$.
$\dot{\alpha} \phi \hat{\alpha} \alpha \rho \tau \omega]$ ' incorruptible; ' nearly equi-
 16. This epithet is only found in union with $\Theta \epsilon b s$, here and Rom. i. 23 ; comp. Wisdom xii. 1. Both this and the two following cpithets must be connected with $\Theta \in \hat{\varphi}$, not $\beta a \sigma t \lambda \in \hat{\imath}$ (Auth. Version, Conyb., al.), which is scarcely grammatically tenable. Huther urges against this the omission of the article before the epithet; this, however, frequently takes place in the case of a title in apposition ; see Middleton, Article, p. 387 (ed. Rose). ג̀ opá $\tau \omega]$ 'invisible;' see Col. i. 15, and comp. 1 Tim. vi. 16 ; $\nu \hat{\varphi} \mu o ́ v \varphi$ бкıaүpaфov́-
 Greg. Naz. Orat. xxxviin. 11 (a noble passage), p. 615 D (ed. Morell).
$\mu \delta \partial \varphi \Theta \in \hat{\omega}]$ ' only God;' comp. ch. vi. $15, \delta \mu$ ака́plos каl $\mu \delta \nu$ оs $\delta v \nu \alpha{ }^{\prime} \sigma \tau \eta s$. It is not of serious importance whether, with 1scud.-Ambrose in loc., we refer this appellation to the First Person (' particula $\mu \delta ́ v \notin$ extraneas tantum personas, non autem divinas excludit,' Just., comp. Basil, Eunom. Book Iv. ad fin.) or, with Theodoret and Greg. Naz. (Orat. xxxyi. 8, p. 586 B, ed. Morell), to the three Persons of the blessed Trinity. The former seems most probable ; comp. John xvii. 3. The reading of the text, a 'magnifica lectio,' as Bengel truly calls it, is supported by such preponderating au-
thority [AD'FG opp. to KL.] that it seems difficult to imagine how Leo can still defend the interpolated $\sigma \circ \phi \hat{\varphi}$.
тıцウ̀ каl $\delta \delta \xi a]$ 'honor and ,ylory;' a combination (in doxology) only found here and (with the art.) in Rev. v. 13, comp, iv. 9 sq. St. Paul's usual formula is $\delta o ́ \xi a$ alone, with the art.: se notes on Gul. i. 5. $\epsilon$ is Toìs aî̀vas к. $\boldsymbol{\tau} . \lambda]$ 'to the ages of the ages,' i. e. 'for all eternity;' see notes on Gal. i. 5.
18. $\tau \alpha \dot{u} \tau \eta \nu \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \pi \alpha \rho \alpha \gamma \gamma \in \lambda\{\alpha \nu]$
 єiтє́; ¿̈va, бтратєún к. т. 入., Chrys. The reference of these words has been very differently explained: they have been referred $(a)$ directly to $\pi a p a \gamma \gamma \epsilon i \lambda \eta s$, ver. 3, Calvin, Est., Mack ; (b) to тарaryé-
 к. т. $\lambda .$, Peile ; (d) to \%va orpat., Chrys., De Wette, al., comp. John גiii. 34. The objection to (a) lies in the fact that in ver. $3 \pi a p a \gamma \gamma$. is defined and done with; to (b) that the purport of the $\pi a p a \gamma \gamma$ is not defined, but only its aim stated; and to both that the length of the digression, and the distance of the apodosis from the protasis is far too great: $(c)$ is obviously untenable, as ver. 15 involves no $\pi \alpha \rho a \gamma$ $\gamma \in \lambda i a$ at all. It seems best, then, with Chrys. and the principal modern expositors, to refer $\pi \alpha \rho a \gamma \gamma$. directly to \% $\nu a \sigma \tau \rho a \tau$., and indirectly and allusively to ver. 3 sq., inasmuch as obedience to the command there given must form a part of the $\kappa \alpha \lambda \eta \geqslant \sigma \tau \rho a \tau \epsilon i \alpha$. This verse thus forms a general and appropriate conclusion; ver. 3-11 convey the direct injunctions ; ver. $12-16$ the authority of the apostle ; ver. 18 sq. the virtual substance of his previous injunctions expressed in the simplest form. $\quad \pi a \rho a \tau(\hat{T} \in \mu a i$

$\sigma \circ$ ot] ' $I$ commit unto thee, as a sacred
 Chrys. ; comp. 2 Tim. ii. 2. The use and force of the middle in such forms of expression may be perhaps felt by observing that the object is represented, as it were, emanating from, or belonging to, the subject of the verb; see Krüger, Sprachl. 52. 8. 6, p. 365, and compare Donalds. Gr. §432. 2. bb.
$\kappa \propto \tau \grave{\alpha} \tau$ às, к. т. $\lambda$.] 'in accordance with the forerunning prophecies about thee; ' definingr clause apparently intended to add weight to the apostle's exhortation (áqo-
 ophyl.), and to suggest to Timothy an additional ground of obligation ; '̇кєiv $\omega \nu$

 is thus no necessity for here assuming an hyperbaton, scil. ఫ $\nu a \sigma \tau \rho a \tau \epsilon u ̛ \eta \eta$ кãò $\tau \grave{\alpha} s$ к. т. 入. (CEcum., Möller), a very forced and untenable construction.
$\pi p o a \gamma o v ́ \sigma a s$ ] 'forerunning,' 'precursory;' see Heb. vii. 18, $\pi$ poarovións èvтo入îs. The order of the words might seem to imply the connection of $\dot{\epsilon} \pi\} \sigma \grave{\epsilon}$ with $\pi \rho o a \gamma o v e \sigma a s ~(' l e a d i n g ~ t h e ~ w a y ~ t o, ~$ pointing to you as their ohject,' Matth.), but as this involves a modification of the simple meaning of $\pi \rho o \alpha \dot{\gamma} \omega$, and also (see below) of $\pi \rho \circ \phi \eta \tau \epsilon i \alpha t$ as well; it is best, with De W., Huther, and most modern commentators, to connect $\dot{\epsilon} \pi l$ $\sigma \epsilon \frac{\epsilon}{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}$ with $\pi \rho \circ \phi \eta \tau$ eías. It is not however necessary to give $\pi \rho \rho_{\text {o }}$ a purely temporal sense (Syr.) ; the local or quasi-local meaning which nearly always marks the word in the N. T. may be fully retained; the prophecies went forward, as it were, the heralds and avant-couriers to the actions which they foretold; comp. ch. v. 24.
$\left.\epsilon^{\prime} \pi \dot{i}: \sigma \sigma^{\epsilon}\right]$ 'upon thee,' or, more in accordance with our idiom, 'concerning thee,' 'respecting thee,' Peile. 'Enl marks the ethical direction, which, as it were, the
prophecies took (see Winer, Gr. § 49. 1, p. 362), and, with its proper concomitant idea, of 'ultimate super-position,' points to the object on whom they came down (from above) and rested; see Donalds. Gr. § 483, and compare the exx. in Krüger, Spruchl. § 68. 42.1, p. 543.
$\tau \alpha \mathfrak{s} \pi \rho \circ \phi \eta \tau \in[a s]$ 'the prophecies:' not 'the premonitions of the Holy Spirit'
 $\bar{\epsilon} \delta \epsilon \xi \omega$, Theodoret) which led to the ordination of Timothy (ILammond in loc., Thorndike, Gov. of Churches, ch. Iv. 8, -an interpretation which involves a modification of the meaning of $\pi \rho \circ \phi \eta \tau \epsilon i a$ which the word can scarcely bear), but, in accordance with its usual meaning in the N. T., 'the predictions suggested by the Spirit,' 'the prophecies ' which were uttered over Timothy at his ordination (and perhaps conversion, Fell, compare Theophyl.), foretelling his future zeal and success in the promulgation of the gospel. The plural may point to prophecies uttered at his circumcision and other chief events of his spiritual life (Theophyl.), or, more probahly, to the several sources (the presbyters perhaps) from whence they proceeded at his ordination ; comp. ch. iv. 14, vi. 12.
iva. $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \in \dot{v} \eta$ ] ' that thou mayest war,' ctc. In this use of ' $\nu \alpha a$ after verbs implying 'command,' 'exhortation,' etc., the subjunctive clause is not a mere circumlocution for a simple infinitive, but serves to mark the purpose contemplated by the command as well as the immediate subject of it; compare Luke x. 40, al., and see Winer, Gr. § 44. 8, p. 299 sq. On the uses of iva in the N. T. see notes on Eph. i. $17 . \quad \hat{\epsilon} \nu \alpha u \hat{u} \tau \alpha \hat{i} s]$ 'in them, as your spiritual protection and equipment;' emphatic. The translation of De Wette, 'in the might of;' is not sufficiently exact. The prep. has here its usual and proper force ; it is not iden-


tical in meaning with $\delta$ od（Mosh．，comp． （Ecum．），or with кatá（Kypke，Obs．Vol． Ir．p．351，and virtually Huther）but，in accordance with the image，marks，as it were，the armor in which Timothy was to wage his spiritual warfare ；so Mack， Mattl．，and Winer，Gr．§ 48．a，p． 346 ； comp．also Green，Gr．p．289．Huther ohjects to this as artificial，but surely his own interpretation＇within，in the bounds of their application，＇is more open to the charge，and scarcely so intelligible．
$\sigma \tau p \alpha \tau \in i \alpha \nu]$＇warfare；＇not $\mu \alpha \alpha^{\prime} \chi \eta$ ， Theodoret（＇Kampf，＇De W．），but more inclusively，＇militiam，＇Clarom．，Vulg．， －the service of a $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \iota \omega$＇$\eta s$ in all its details and particulars；comp．Huther in loc．For examples of this simplest form of the cognate accus．（when the subst．is involved in the verb，and only serves to amplify its notion），see Winer， Gr．§ 32．2，p．201，and for a correct val－ uation of the supposed rhetorical force， the excellent article by Lobeck，Parali－ pom．p． 501 sq．

19．モ̌ $\chi \omega \nu$ ］＇having，＇Hammond；not ＇retinens＇（Beza）as a shield or weapon （Mack，Matth．），in reference to the pre－ ceding metaphor，－this would have been expressed by a more precise word，e．g àva入aßढ้y，Eph．vi． 16, or＇innitens＇ as a ship on an anchor（Pricæus），in reference to the succeeding metaphor， but simply，＇habens，＇scil．as an inward and subjective possession：so Syriac， where the verb is simply replaced by the prep．$=$（in，with）；see also Meyer on Rom．xv．4．$\dot{\alpha} \gamma \alpha \hat{N} \grave{\eta} \nu \sigma v \nu \in\{\delta$ ．］ ＇a good conscience；＇see notes on ver． 5
 $\delta \eta \sigma \iota \nu . \quad \dot{\alpha} \pi \omega \sigma \alpha \mu \in \nu 0 九]$＇having
 Hesych．；see exx．in Wetst．on Rom．xi． 1．This expressive word marks the de－ liberate nature of the act，the wilful vio－
lence which the tives（ver．3）did to their better nature．＇A $\pi \omega \sigma$ б́to（ $\lambda$ ó yov，Acts xiii． 46 ；elsewhere in the N．T．with persons，Acts vii．27，39，Rom．xi．1，2， LXX）occurs very frequently in the LXX，and several times with abstract nouns（ $\delta \iota \alpha \hat{\eta} \kappa \eta \nu, 2$ K．xvii． 15 （Alex．）； ${ }^{\epsilon} \lambda \pi \uparrow \delta \alpha$ ，Jer．ii． 37 ；vó $\mu \mathrm{\nu} \nu$ ，Jer．vi． 19 ； éoptàs，Amos v．21）as a translation of Ow．The objection of Schleierm．（üb．I Tiin．p．36）that St．Paul elsewhere uses this word properly（Rom．xi．1，2）as in reference to something external，not in－ ternal，is pointless ；Rom．l．c．is a quo－ tation．Conscience is here suitably rep－ resented，as it were，another and a better self．Viewed practically the sentiment is of great moment ；the loss of a good conscience will cause shiprvreck of faith． Olsh．$\quad \pi \in \rho \ell \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \pi\{\sigma \tau \iota \nu]$ ＇concerning，in the matter of，the faith．＇ Loesner compares Philo，de Somn．p． 1128 D［Ir．§ 21．Vol．I．p．678，ed．


 there is however some difference in the use of the prep．In Philo l．c．it marks really what led to the shipwreck；the accusatives properly representing the ob－ jects＇around which the action or motion take place，＇sce Winer，Gr．§ 49．i，p． 361 ，Donalds．Gr．§ 482 ．c：in the pres－ ent case merely the object in reference to which it happened，perhaps more usually expressed by the gen．，see Rost u．Palm， Lex．s．v．$\pi \in \rho$ 亿́，I．1．e，Vol．Ir．p． 821. At any rate it is surely an oversight in Huther to say that $\pi \epsilon \rho l$ with the accus． is here used in the sense in which it usu－ ally stands with the dat．；for，in the first place，$\pi \in \rho$ l with dat．is rarely found in Attic prose and never in the N．T．；and， secondly，$\pi \epsilon \rho$ l with dat．（＇around and upon，＇Donaldson，Gr． 482 ．b），if more

##  

usual in prose, might have been suitable in Philo l.c. (the rock on which they split,—comp. Soph. Frag. 149, $\pi \in \rho l$ द̀ $\mu \hat{\varphi}$ «ápą катá $\gamma \nu \cup \tau \alpha \iota ~ \tau ̀ ̀ ~ \tau \epsilon \grave{\chi} \chi o s)$, but certainly not in the present passage. Kypke (Obs. Vol. 11. p. 353) cites a somewhat different use, $\pi \in \rho l \tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ K $\omega \alpha \nu \nu$ શ́́ $\lambda \alpha \sigma \sigma \alpha \nu \nu \nu \alpha a \gamma \eta{ }^{-}$ $\sigma \alpha l$, Diog. Laert. I. 1. 7, where the acc. scems to mark the area where the disaster took place, see Rost u. Palm, Lex. s. v. $\pi \epsilon \rho i$, III. 2, Vol. 1I. p. 825.
20. ' $\Upsilon \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \alpha เ 0$ s] There does not seem any sufficient ground for denying the identity of Hymenæus with the heretic of that name in 2 Tim. ii. 17. Mosheim (de Rebus, etc., p. 177 sq.) urges the comparatively milder terms in which Hymenæus is spoken of, $2 \mathrm{Tim} . l . c$. ; the one he says was the 'open enemy,' the other 'the insidious corrupter' of Christianity. On comparing however the two passages, it will be seen that the language and even structure is far too similar to render any such distinction either plausible or probable. The only difference is, that here the apostle notices the fact of his excommunication, there his fundamental error; that error however was a $\beta$ є́ $\beta \cdot \eta \lambda$ os $\kappa \in \nu 0 \phi \omega \nu i \alpha, 2$ Tim. ii 16. This certainly affords a hint (somewhat too summarily repudiated by Wieseler, Chronol. p. 314), in favor of the late date of this epistle; see notes on ver. 3.
'A $\lambda \in \epsilon \xi \alpha \nu \delta \rho o s]$ It is more difficult to decide whether this person is identical ( $a$ ) with Alexander, $\delta$ $\chi$ aлкєús, 2 Tim. iv. 14, or (b) with Alexander, Acts xix. 33, or (as seems most probable) different from either. The addition $\delta \chi \alpha \lambda \kappa \epsilon \nu$ s in the second epistle, and the fact that he seems to have been more a personal adversary of the apostle's than an heretical teacher, incline us to distinguish him from the excommunicate Alexander. All that can be said
in favor of $(b)$ is that the Alexander, mentioned Acts l.c., was probably a Christian; see Meyer in loc., and Wieseler, Chronol. p. 56. The commonness of the names makes any historical or chronological inferences very precarions ; sec Neander, Planting, Vol. I. p. 347 , note (Bohn).
$\pi \alpha \rho \in ́ \delta \omega \kappa \alpha \tau \hat{\varphi}$ $\Sigma \alpha \tau \alpha \nu \hat{a}]$ 'I delivered over to Satan,' 'tradidi Satanæ,' Vulgate,- scil. at some former period. The exact meaning of this formula has been much discussel. Does it mean (a) simply, excommunication? Theod. in loc. and on 1 Cor. v. 5, Theoph. in loc., Bals., on Can. vir. (Basilii), al. ; comp. Johnson, Unhl. Sacr. ch. 4, Vol. II. p. 233 (Angl. Cath. Libr.) ; or (b) simply, supernatural infliction of corporeal suffering, Wolf on Cor. l. c., and appy. Chrys., who adduces the example of Job ; or (c) both combined, Meyer, and most modern interpreters? The latter view seems most in harmony with this passage, and esp. with 1 Cor. l.c., where simple exclusion from the Church
 clude then with Waterland, that 'delivery over to Satan' was a form of Christian excommunication, declaring the person reduced to the state of a heathen, accompanied with the authoritative infliction of bodily disease or death ; on Funclamentals, ch. 4, Vol. i11. p. 460. The patristic views will be found in Suicer; Thesaur. Vol. Ir. p. 940, and Petavins, Theol. Dogm. Vol. iv. p. 108 . In this fearful formula, the offender is given over $\tau \hat{\varphi} \Sigma a \tau \alpha \nu \hat{q}$, to the Evil One in his most distinct personality ; comp. notes on $E_{l}{ }^{h}$. iv. 27. $\pi \alpha \iota \delta \in U \hat{\omega} \omega \bar{\omega} \sigma \nu$ ] 'be disciplined,' Hamm. ; 'taught by punishment,'. Conyb. The true Christian meaning of raı $\delta \in \dot{v} \epsilon \iota \nu$, 'per molestias erudire,' is here distinctly apparent; see Trench, Synon. § 32 , and notes on Eph. vi. 4.

I exhort tlat prayers he offered for all, for this is acceptable to God, who willeth the salvation of all, and whose Gospel I preach.

Cinapter II. 1. tapakajêo oủ $\nu$ ] 'I exhort then;' 'in pursuance of my general admonition (ch. i. 18) I proceed to special details.' It is singular that Schleierm., and after him De W., should find here no logical connection, when really the sequence of thought seems so easy and natural, and has been so fairly explained by several older (comp. Corn. a Lap.), and most modern expositors. In ch. i. 18 , the apostle gives Timothy a commission in general terms, I $v a \sigma \tau \rho a-$ тeún к. т. $\lambda$. This, after the very slight digression in ver. 19, 20, he proceeds to unfold in particulars, the first and most important of which is the duty of prayer in all its forms. The particle oủv has thus its proper collective force (' ad ea, quæ antea posita sunt, lectorem revocat,' Klotz; 'continuation and retrospect,' Donalds. Gr. § 604), and could not properly be replaced by any other particle; see Klotz, Deiar. Vol. II. p. 717. For the use of this and similar particles, the student is especially referred to Euclid (e. g. Book I) : the careful perusal in the original language of three or four leading propositions will give him more exact views of the real force of $\alpha \rho a$, oùv $\kappa . \tau, \lambda$. than he could readily acquire in any other way.
$\pi \rho \bar{\omega} \tau 0 \nu$ $\pi \alpha \dot{ } \nu \tau \omega \nu$ ] 'first of all,' 'imprimis;' not priority in point of time, sc. ${ }^{2} \nu \tau \hat{\jmath} \lambda \alpha \tau \rho \in i \not q$ $\tau \hat{\eta} \kappa \alpha \hat{\imath} \eta \mu \in \rho \stackrel{\imath}{n}$, Chrys. (compare Conyb. and Howsen), 'diluculo,' Erasm.,-but of dignity; see Bull, Serm. Xinf. p. 243 (Oxf. 1844), and comp. Matth. vi. 33. The adverb is thus less naturally con-
 ing word таракал $\hat{\omega}$ (Syr., Auth. Ver.). The combination $\pi \rho \bar{\omega} \tau o \nu$ $\pi \alpha ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu$ only occurs in the N. T. in this place.
$\delta \in \dot{\eta} \sigma \in \iota$ к. $\tau . \lambda$. 'petitions, prayers, supplications, thanksgivings.' It has been
somewhat hastily maintained by Heinr., 1) W. (comp. Justin.), al., that the first three terms are little more than synonymous, and only cumulatively denote prayer. On the other hand several special distinctions (comp. Theodoret in loc., Greg. Naz. C'arm. 15, Vol. 11. p. 200) and applications (August. Epist. Lix. 12) have been adduced, which certainly cannot be substantiated. Still there is a difference: $\delta \in ́ \eta \sigma t s$ seems a special form (rogatio) of the more gencral $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \in u \chi \eta$ n (precatio), see notes on Eph. vi. 18; ढั้$\tau \in \cup \xi \varsigma \iota s$ (ch. iv. 5) is certainly not a $\delta \in ́ \eta \sigma \iota s$ єis є̇кठiкךбเข (Hesych. ; comp. Theod.), but; as its derivation (ėv $\nu v \gamma \chi \alpha ́ \nu \omega)$ suggests, prayer in its most individual and urgent form (ėvt. kal ékßoñots, Philo, Quod Det. Pot. § 25, Vol. I. p. 209), prayer in which God is, as it were, sought in audience (Polyb. Hist. v. 35. 4., IIr. 15.4), and personally drawn nigh to ; compare Origen, de Orat. § 4t,
 ova ÉXovtos. Thus, then, as Huth. observes, the first term marks the idea of our insufficiency [ $\delta \in \hat{\imath}$, compare Beng.], the second that of devotion, the third that of childlike confidence. The ordinary translation, 'intercessions,' as Authorized Ver., Alf,, al. (comp. Scboettg. in loc.), too much restricts $\neq \nu \tau \in \cup \xi ้ s$, as it does not per se imply any reference to others : see ch. iv. 5 , where such a meaning would be inappropriate, and comp. Rom. viii. 27, 34 , xi. 2, Heb. vii. 25 , where the preposition, vinṫp or katà, marks the reference and direction of the prayer; see especially the examples in Raphel, Annotations Vol. II. p. 567 sq. who has very copiously illustrated this word. $\in \dot{\nu} \chi \alpha \rho \iota \sigma \tau\{\alpha s\}$ ' thanksgivings :' thanksgiving, was to be the perpetual concomitant of prayer; see


esp．Phil．iv．6，Col．iv． 2 ；Justin M． Apul．1．13，67，al．，and comp．Harless， Ethik，§31．a．It is scarcely necessary to say that the special translation＇eucha－ rists ${ }^{2}$（J．Johnson，Unbl．Sacr．1．2．Vol． 11．p．66，Angl．Cath．Libr．），is wholly untenable．$\quad \dot{v} \pi$ ย̀ $\rho \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \omega \nu$ $\dot{\alpha} \nu \geqslant \rho$ ．is to be connected，not merely with the last，but with all the foregoing


 Theodoret．To further encourage this universality in prayer Justin，Apol．In． 15），the apostle proceeds to specify，nom－ inutim，particular classes for whom it ought to be offered；comp．Chrys．in loc．

2．$\dot{\nu} \pi \grave{\epsilon} \rho \beta a \sigma b \lambda \epsilon \omega \nu]$＇for Kings，＇－ gencrally，without any special reference to the Roman emperors．It is an in－ stance of the perverted ingenuity of Baur （comp．De W．）to refer the plural to the emperor and his associate in rule，as they appear in the age of the Antonines； surely this would have been $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \beta \alpha \sigma t-$ $\lambda \epsilon$＇$\omega \nu$ ．On the custom，generally，of praying for kings（Ezra vi．10，Baruch i．11），see Justin，Apol．1．17，Tertull． Apologet．cap．39，the passages collected by Ottius，Spicileg．p．433，and Grinf． Schol．Hell．Vol．11．p．580．It is very noticeable that the neglect of this duty on the part of the Jews led to the com－ mencement of their war with the Ro－ mans，see Joseph．Bell．Jud．II．17．2． $\left.{ }^{\epsilon} \dot{\nu} \nu \dot{v} \pi \in \rho \circ \chi \hat{\eta}\right]$ ］in authority ；${ }^{2}$ all who have any share of constituted authority，

 $\kappa \in \notin e ́ v o v$, Polyb．Hist．v．41．3．тoîs є $\nu$ ย̇тєрохवîs oû $\sigma t \nu$ ．
iva グрє $\mu \circ \nu$ $\kappa$ ．$\tau_{0} \lambda$ ．］in order that we may pass a quiet and tranquil life：＇contemplated end and object，not import of the interces－


 vimápxel，Chrys．The prayer has clearly not a purely subjective reference，＇that we may lead a life of quietude and sub－ mission＇（Mack，comp．Heydenr：），nor again a purely objective reference，＇that they may thus let us live in quiet，＇but in fact involves both，and has alike a per－ sonal and a political application，－－＇that through their good government we may enjoy peace：＇the blessing＇the powers that be＇will receive from our prayers will redound to us in outward peace and inward tranquillity；comp．Wiesing．in loc．${ }^{y} \mathrm{H} \rho \epsilon \mu \mathrm{os}$ is a late form of adjective derived from the adv．ض̀ $\epsilon^{\prime} \mu a$ ；comp．Lu－ cian，Trugod．209，Eustath．1l．vir．p． 142．9．Lobeck（Pathol．p．158）cites a single instance of its usage in early Greck；Inscr．Olbiopol．No．2059．The correct adjectival form is $\eta \boldsymbol{\eta} \epsilon \mu a i o s$ ． ท̀ $\sigma$ ט́ $\nless \circ \nu$ ］＇tranquil；＇once only again， 1 Pet．iii．4，тồ $\pi \rho a \notin ́ o s ~ к a l ~ \eta ̀ \sigma u \chi ł o u ~ \pi \nu \in v ́-~$ aacos．The distinction drawn by Olsh． between そ̈pє $\mu$ os and ríóvxios can appy．be substantiated；the former［connected ap－ parently with Sanscr．ram，＇rest in a chamber，＇－the fundamental idea accord－ ing to Pott，Etym．Forsch．Vol．I．p． 262］seems to denote tranquillity arising from without，＇qui ab aliis non perturba－ tur，＇Tittmann ；compare Plato，Def．p．


 latter［connected with＇Hฐ－； $\bar{\eta} \mu \alpha \iota$ ，Ben－ fcy，Wurzellex．Vol．x p．418］tranquillity arising from within， 1 Pet．l．c．；comp． Plato，Charm．p． $160 \mathrm{~A}, \hat{\eta} \sigma \dot{0} \chi \cos \delta{ }^{\circ}$ ów－ фршע Bios．So，in effect，Tittmann，ex－ cept that he assigns to $\dot{\eta} \sigma \dot{v} \chi$ ．more of an active meaning，＇qui aliis nullas turbas excitat，＇Synon．1．p．65．On the use of Blos for＇manner of life，＇comp．＇Trench；

## 



Synon．§ 27. к．т．入．］＇in all godliness and gravily；＂ the moral sphere in which they were to move．Metà might have been used with $\sigma \varepsilon \mu \nu$ ón ${ }^{\prime}$（comp．iii．4），but would have been less appropriate with èvé $\beta \in \iota a$ ；the latter is to be not merely an accompani－ ment but a possession（comp．Heb，xi． 2，and Winer，Gr．§ 48．a，p．346），the sphere in which they were always to walk．It is proper to observe that both these substantives are only used by St ． Paul in the Pastoral Epistles．
 Jehove］Syr．，is a word which occurs several times in these Epp．e．g．ch．iii． 16，iv． 7,8 ，vi． $3,5,6,11,2$ Tim．iii． 5 ， Tit．i．1，see also Acts iii．12， 2 Pet．i．3， 6,7 ，iii．11．It properly denotes only ＇well－directed reverence＇（Trench，Synon． §48），but in the N．T．is practically the same as शeoof $\beta \in \epsilon \alpha$（ch．ii．10），and is well defined by Tittmann，Synon．I．p． 146 ，as＇vis pietatis in ipsâ vitâ vel ex－ ternâ vel internâ，＇and more fully，but with accuracy，by Euseb．，Prcep．Ecang．


 then $\epsilon^{\mathcal{U}} \sigma^{\prime} \beta$ ．conveys the idea，not of an ＇inward，inherent holiness，but，as Alford （on Acts iii．12）correctly observes，of a ＇practical，operative，cultive piety ：＇sce other，but less precise，definitions in Sui－ cer，Thesaur．s．v．Vol：1．1264，and esp． the discriminating remarks of Harless， Ethik，§ 37.
$\sigma \in \mu \nu \delta \tau \eta s$ （only here，ch．iii．4，and Titus ii．7）ap－ pears to denote that＇decency and pro－ priety of deportment，＇＇morum gravitas et castitas，＇Estius（Ehrbarkeit，＇Luther）， which befite the chaste（Chrys．；comp．， in an exaggerated sense，Eur．Iph．Aul． 1350），the young，（ch．iii．4，Tit．ii．7），
and the earnest（Joseph．Bell．Jud．II． 8. 2），and is，as it were，the appropriate setting of higher graces and virtues； compare Joseph．Vit．$\S 49, \mu \in \tau \grave{\alpha} \pi d ́ o \eta s$
 течна．．

 จ̦é $\lambda \in t$ ，Chrys．This verse stands in more immediate connection with ver． 1 ，of which verse 2 really only forms a semi－ parenthetical illustration．To please God is the highest motive that can influ－ ence a Christian．rà $\rho$ is omitted by Lachm．with A；17．67＊⿻丷木大 ；Copt．，Su－ hid．（not Pesch．，as Bloomf．asserts），－ evidence，however，fur from sufficient． The omission very probably arose from a want of perception of the true connec－ tion between ver． 1,2 ，and 3 ．
$\kappa a \lambda \delta \nu \kappa a l \dot{\alpha} \pi \sigma \delta \in \kappa T \delta \nu]$ Not＇good and acceptable before＇－Huth．，Wiesing．， Alf．，but，＇yood（per se）and acceptable before God，＇Mack，De Wette，al．；каl $\tau \hat{p} \phi \dot{\sigma} \sigma \in l$ दे $\sigma \tau l$ к $\alpha \lambda o ́ \nu . . .$. каl $\tau \hat{\varphi}$ Өє̣̂ $\delta \hat{\varepsilon}$ à $\pi о \delta є \kappa \tau \delta \dot{v}$ ，Theophylact．Huther urges against this 2 Cor．viii． 21 ，$\pi \rho o \nu 00 \hat{\nu} \mu \in ?$
 but there，as still more clearly in Rom． xii．17，троуоо仑̂ $\mu \in \nu$ оь кал⿳亠 ［орр．to как $\delta \nu$ ，
 latter clause $\epsilon \nu \omega$ íto $\kappa$ к．$\tau . \lambda$ ．is not con－ nected simply with ràá，but with $\pi p o \nu$ ．
 à $\pi \delta \delta \delta є \kappa т о s$ ，as Lachm．，Tisch．；see Lo－ beck，Paralip．vir．11，p．490）is used in N．T．only here，and ch．v． 4 ；compare àтобо天向，ch．i．15．T०रे $\sigma \omega \tau \hat{\eta}-$ pos к．т．$\lambda$ ．］our Saviour Ciod：＇sce notes on ch．i．1．The appropriateness of the title is evinced by the following verse．

4．ठो $\pi$ ávtas к．т．l．］＇whose，i．e． seeing his will is（not＇whose wish is，＇ Peile ；compare notes on ch．v．14）that all men should be saved，＇etc．；explanatory
and faintly confirmatory of the preceding assertion ; see Col. i. 25, and notes in loc. On this slightly causal, or perhaps rather explanatory force of ös, see Ellendt, Lex. Soph. s. v. ini. 3, Vol. II. p. 371, and comp. Bernhardy, Synt. vi. 12. a, p. 291 sq. $\quad \pi a ́ v \tau \alpha s]$ Emplutic, Rom. viii. 32 ; 'omnes, etiam non credentes, vult salvari, Beng.; $\mu \mu \nu \hat{v} ~ \cdot-\partial \nu$


 various dogmatical expositions of this important verse will be found in Justiniani, Corn. a Lap., and Estius in loc.; compare also Petavius, Theol. Dogmut. Vol. I. Book x. 1. 2 sq., Vol. v. Book xini. 1. 3, 4, Forbes, Instruct. viif. 18, p. 415 sq. Without entering upon them in detail, or overstepping the limits prescribed to this commentary, it seems proper to remark that all attempted restrictions ('quosvis homines, Beza, compare August. Enchirid. § 103 ; compare contr. Winer, Gr. § 18. 4, p. 101) of this rital text are as much to be reprehended on the one hand, as that perilous universulism on the other, which ignores or explains away the clear declaration of Scripture, that there are those whose ū $\lambda$ estpos shall be aíwntos ( 2 Thess. i. 9), and whose portion shall be the $\delta \in \dot{r} t \in \rho o s$ ฟัúvaros (Rev. xxi. 8): the remarks of Usteri, Lehrb. 11. B. p. 352 sq. are very unsatisfuctory. Setting aside all technical, though perhaps plausible, distincsions between the 'voluntas antecedens' and 'voluntas consequens' of God (Damasc. Orth. Fid. 11. 29), it seems enough to say, that Scripture declares in terms of the greatest latitude (see esp. Hammond, Fundamentals, xiv. 2, and comp. Pruct. Cutechism 11. 2, p. 18, Angl. C. Libr.) that God does will the salvation ( $\sigma \omega$ àñvat not $\sigma \omega \bar{\omega} \alpha a$ ) of all ; all are rendered (through Jesus Christ) 'salvabi-
les' and 'salvandi' (Barrow, Serm. 72). That some are indisputably not saved (Matt. xxv. 41 sq., Rev. xx. 10, 15, xxii. 15 , al.) is not due to any outward circumscription or inefficacy of the Divine શ̇è $\lambda \eta \mu$ (Episcop. Inst. Theol. 1v. 2. 21), but to man's rejection of the special means of salvation which God has been pleased to appoint, and to which it is also His Divine Ṅé $\lambda \eta \mu \alpha$ (Eph. i. 9) that man's salvation should be limited: comp. Müller on Sin, irr. 2. 1, Vol. 11. p. 211 (Clark). In a word, redemption is universal, yet conditional ; all may be saved, yet all will not be saved, because all will not conform to God's appointed conditions; see Hammond, l.c. § 15 ; and esp. Barrow, Worlss, Vol. iv. p. 1-97, who in four sermons ( $71-74$ ) has nearly exhausted the subject. The two further momentous questions connected with this doctrine are fairly stated by Ebrard, Dogniatik, § 557 sq., Vol. 11. p. 689, comp. also Martensen, Dogn2. § 219 sq.
$\kappa a\} \in i s \in \dot{\epsilon} \pi\{\gamma \nu \omega \sigma \iota \nu$ к. $\tau . \lambda$. .) 'and to come to the (full) linowledge of the truth;' comp. 2 Tim. ii. 25 , iii. 7 : no inversion of clauses, but a further specification of the more immediate object and end; see Winer, Gr. § 61. 3. obs.; p. 488. The $\sigma \omega \hat{\eta} \eta \mathrm{pa}$ is the ultimate, the eis $\dot{e} \pi i \gamma \nu$. $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta ง$. ${ }^{2} \lambda \lambda \epsilon \bar{\nu} \nu$, an immediate end leading naturally and directiy to the former. The introduction of this latter moment of thought is suggrested by, and suitably precedes, the enunciation of the great truth which is contained in the following verse. On éní $\gamma \nu \omega \sigma$ ts (' cognitio certa et accurata') see notes on Eph. i. 17, and on the emissions of the art. notes on 2 Tim. ii. 25. It may be remarked that
 implies no mere theoretical, but, practical and saving truth, 'veritas salvifica,' as revealed in the Gospel ; $\dot{\lambda} \lambda \eta \vartheta$. nofas; $\tau \hat{\eta} s$ єis aủ

## 



Reuss, Théol. iv. 8, Vol. 11. p. 82. A special treatise on this word has been written by Baumann, Strasb. 1838.
5. $\epsilon$ is $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho \Theta \epsilon \delta s$ ] 'For there is one God; proof of the foregoing explanatory assertion, the $\gamma$ àp having here its simple argumentative foree, and connecting this verse, not with ver. 1 (Leo, Mack), but with the verse immediately preceding. Eis and $\pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau a s$ stand thus in correlation ; the universality of the dispensation is proved by the unity of the Dispenser. The existence of different dispensations for different portions of the human race, would seem inconsistent with the conception of one supreme. all-ruling Creator; ' unius Dei una providentia;' compare Rom. iii. 30, where a similar argument is introduced by the forcible (Hartung, Part. Vol. I. p. 342) Ė $\pi \epsilon i ́ \pi \epsilon \rho$.
$\in \hat{i} s k \alpha i \mu \in \sigma i \tau \eta s]$ 'one mediator also:'
 In this and similar distinctions between the first and second Persons of the blessed Trinity (comp. 1 Cor. viii. 6, Eph. iv. 4-6), Reuss finds traces of a citraAthanasian view (so to speak) of the subordination of the Son; Theol. Chret. iv. 10, Vol. 11. p. 102. This is not correct: all that could reasomably be inferred from such a text as the present is the catholic doctrine of a subordination in respect of office; see Warerland, Second Find. Vol. II. p. 400. The position of De Wette after Schleierm. (über: 1 Tim. p. 1i7), that this use of $\mu \in \sigma i \tau \eta s$, without definite allusion to a $\delta<a \ni \eta \not \kappa \eta$, argues a compiler from the Ep. to the Heb, (viii. 6 , ix. 15 , xii 24 ), is not entitled to scrious attention or confutation. The previous allusion to redemption (rer. 4) and the antithesis of the $\epsilon[5$ © $\Theta d s$ and $\pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau$. $\dot{\alpha} \nu \hat{\beta} \rho$. suggest the use of a term that best sustains that relation : see also Ebrard, Dogm. §406, and a good sermon by Bev-
eridge, Serm. Vol. Ir. p. 86 sq. (Angl. Cath. Libr. $\quad \Theta \in \sigma \hat{v} \kappa \alpha\}$ $\dot{\alpha} \nu \geqslant \rho \omega \pi \omega \nu]$ 'of God and men :' both anarthrous; the former in accordater with its common privilege of rejecting the article (see exx. Winer, Gr. $\$ 19, p$. 110), the latter, from a bare indication of the other party only being necessary. In both cases the omission is obviously suggested by the familiarity of both the terms connected by the conjunction ; see Green, Gro. Iv. 3, p. 181.
á $\nu$ จ $\rho \omega \pi$ os X. 'I.] 'a man Christ .Jesus.' The humán nature of Christ is specially mentioned as being the state in which His mediatorial office was visibly per-

 $\sigma a s ~ \gamma \grave{a} \rho ~ द ̇ \mu \in \sigma i ́ \tau \in v \sigma \in \nu$, Theod. On the duration of Christ's mediation, see Pearson, Creed, Art. vi. Vol. I. 334 (ed. Burton). The omission of the article (scarcely noticed by the modern German commentators) must be preserved in translation. Middleton (Greel: Art. p. 388, ed. Rose) considers the article unnecessary, and compares $\alpha \sim \nu \Delta \rho$. X. 'I. with кúplos X. 'I.; but the comparison fails, as кúplos has so unequivocally the character of a proper name ; comp. Winer, Gr. § 19, p. 113. In a different context Christ might clearly have been designated as $\delta \alpha_{\alpha} \nu \underset{\sim}{ } \rho \cdot$., 'the (representative) man of humanity' (comp. Peile in loc.) ; here, however, as the apostle only wishes to mark the nature in which Christ $\epsilon^{\mu} \mu \in \sigma_{i} \tau \in \cup \sigma \in \nu$, but not any relation in which He stood to that nature, he designedly omits the article. The distinction of Alford between 'individual and generic humanity' seens here out of place, and not involved in the context: contrast Wordsw, in loc., who pertinently cites August. Serm. xxvr. Vol. v. p. 174, ed. Mignc.
6. $\dot{\alpha} \nu \tau\{\lambda v \tau \rho \circ \nu]^{\text {‘ }}$ ransom; the $\dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \iota$


being here by no means redundant (Schleierm. p.42, comp. Suicer, Thesaur. s. v. Vol. 1. p. 377), but serving to express the idea of exchange, 'permutationem, quâ veluti capite caput et vitâ vitam redemit,' Just. ; compare ả ávád $\lambda \alpha \gamma \mu a$, Matt. xvi. 26, ả $\nu \tau i \notin u \chi o v, ~ I g n a t . ~ S m y r n . ~$ 10, and the valuable remarks on it of Pearson, Vind. Ign. chap. xv. p. 597 (Angl. C. Libr.). In this important word the idea of a substitution of Christ in our stead cannot be ignored (see, thus far, Reuss, Theol. Chret. iv. 17, Vol. II. p. 185, sq.), especially when connected with passages of such deep significance as Rom. iii. 25 (our Lord's death was a true 'expiatorium,' a propitiatory sacrifice,' see Meyer on Rom. l. c.) and Eph. v. 2 : compare also Meyer on Rom. v. 6 , and for some calm and clear comments on this 'satisfactio vicaria,' Martensen, Dogmatik, § 157 sq., p. 343. All the modern theories of atonement seem to forget that God hates $\sin$ as $\sin$, not as a personal offence against Himself. How is a God thus holy and just to be reconciled? See M‘Cosh, Divine Gov. 15. 2. 3, p. 475 (4th ed.). Waterland's words are few, but very weighty; on Fundam. Vol, v. p. 82.
$\hat{v} \pi \grave{\varepsilon} \rho \pi \alpha \nu \tau \omega \nu$ ] On the meaning of $\dot{\nu} \pi \notin \rho$ in dogmatical passages, see notes on Gal. iii. 13. Here $\dot{\tau} \pi \grave{\epsilon} \rho($ ' in commodum') seems to point to the benefit conferred by Christ upon us, à ài to His substitution of Himself in our place.
$\tau \delta \mu \alpha \rho \tau v \rho \leqslant o \nu \kappa . \tau . \lambda$.] 'the (import of the) testimony (to be set forth) in its proper
 テi.) tempore suo], not ' the proof of it,' ete, Middleton , Art. p. 389. Some little dif- $^{\text {. }}$ ficulty las been felt in these words, owing to the true nature of the apposition
not having been recognized. Tò $\mu \mu \mathrm{p} \tau$ úpıov is an accusative in apposition, to the preceding sentence, not to à $\nu \tau$ í $\lambda u \tau \rho o \nu$ (öтt
 $\pi$ d́̇os, Theophyl. 2), but to $\delta$ סoùs ..... $\pi \alpha ́ v t \omega \nu$, scil. 'quce res (nempe quod suâ ipsius morte omnes homines reclemisset, Luke xxiv. 46, 47) testimonii suo tempore (ab apostolis) dicendi argumentum esset,' Fritz. Rom. xii. 1, Vol. inf. p. 12, where this passage is very carefully investigated; sce also Winer, Gr. § 59. 9. p. 472, and Scholef. Hints, p. 118. Thus there is no reason whatever for modifying the text (Lücke, Stud. u. Krit. for 1836, p. 651 sq.) ; the insertion of of before $\tau \delta$ $\mu a \rho \tau .$, with DFG al., and of Ėós $^{\eta} \eta$ after ioiots with $\mathrm{D}^{1} \mathrm{FG}$, are incorrect (compare Fritz.) explanatory additions, and the omission of to $\mu \alpha \rho \tau$. in A due apparently to accident. $\quad \kappa \alpha \iota \rho \circ$ iेs $i \delta$ \{oıs] ‘its own seasons ;' scil. тoîs $\pi \rho \circ \sigma$ そ̆коvat, Chrys. It is singular that Lücke should have felt any difficulty in this formula; comp. Gal. vi. 16, and somewhat similarly Polyb. Hist. I. 30. 10, xvini. 34, 6. 'Tempus testimonio de Christi morte expiatoriâ hominibus ab apostolis dicendo idoneum, illud tempus est quod a Spiritus Sancti adventu ad apostolos (Acts i. 8) usque ad solemnem Christi reditum de cœelo ( 2 Thess. i. 10) labitur,' Fritz. l.c. The dative then is not a quasi dat. commodi (compare Scholef., Peile), but the dat. of the time wherein the action takes place; comp. Rom. xvi. 25, रpóvots aiwvíots $\sigma \in \sigma \iota \gamma \eta \mu$ évov, and sce exx. in Winer, Gram. § 31. 9; p. 195. This form of the temporal dative thus approximates to the ordinary use of the temporal gen. ('period within which;' comp. Donalds, Gr. §451. ff, Truïger, Sprachl. § 47.2), and is more correctly preceded by ${ }_{e} \nu \mathrm{~V}$; see Krüger, Sprachl. § 48. 2, Wannowski, Constr. Als. III, 1,

I desire that the men pray reverently, and that the women dress and comport themselves with modesty.

## 


8. $\delta \iota a \lambda o \gamma เ \sigma \mu \circ \hat{\nu}]$ So ADKL, Vulg., and many Vv., Origen (3), Chrrs., Theodoret (text), al. (Rec., Griesh, Matth., Scholz, Lachm., De Wette (e sil.), Huther, 1!f.). The plural $\delta \iota a \lambda \gamma \iota \sigma \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ is adopted by Tisch. with FG: 17. 67**. 73. 80 [MSS that it is asserted commonly accord with B], and many others; Boern., Copt. Syr. (both) ; Origen (4), Eusel., Basil, Theorl., al. As the cexternal anthorities seem decidedly to preponderate in favor of the former, and as it seems more probable that the plural should be a correction of the less usual singular (only in Luke ix. 46,47 ), than that the singular should have been altered from the plural for the sake of symmetry in number with obphs, we retain the reading of the Reccived Text.
p. 88. The temporal gen., except in a few familiar forms, is rare in the N. T.
7. $\epsilon$ is 8]] 'for which,' scil. $\mu$ aptúptov; ' cui testimonio dicendo constitutus sum præco,' Fritz. Rom. xii. 1, Vol. IIr. p. 15, note. кй $\rho v \xi]$ ' $a$ herald,' ' præco solemnis, a Deo missus,' Beng.; only here, 2 Tim. i. 11, and 2 Pet. ii. 5. There is no necessity in the present case for modifying (' preedicator,' Vulg.) the primary meaning of the word; compare
 $\kappa \eta \rho$., and see esp. 1 Cor. ix. 27, where $\kappa \eta \rho \dot{v} \sigma \sigma \epsilon เ \nu$ is used of the 'agonistic herald 'in accordance with the tenor of the foremoing verses; see Meyer in loc.
$\dot{\alpha} \pi \delta \sigma \tau o \lambda o s$ ] 'an apostle,' in the higher

 тov, Theophyl. : see notes on Gal. i. 1.
 lic not.' De Wette seems clearly right in maintaining that this protestation refers to the preceding words; the asseveration with regard to his apostleship was of course not intended for Timothy, but for the false teachers who doubted his apostolical authority. The third official designation $\delta \iota \delta \alpha \alpha^{\prime} \sigma$. $\epsilon^{2} \grave{\nu \omega} \nu$, then follows with full climactic force. To assert that this is a phrase which the apostle used in his later years 'with less force and relevance than he had once done' (Alf.)
appears questionable and precarious. '่ $\nu \pi\{\sigma \tau \in \iota \kappa . \tau . \lambda .]^{\prime}$ in faith and truth;' the spheres in which the apostle performed his mission. The two substantives are commonly taken either both with ob-
 kal being explanatory, Mack (compare Peile, who inappositely cites 2 Thess. ii. 13), or both with subjective reference, 'faithfully and truly' $\epsilon \nu \pi i \sigma \tau . \kappa$. $\dot{\alpha} \lambda$. $=$ $\pi เ \sigma \tau \delta \nu$ каì ả̀ $\eta \grave{\imath} \iota \nu \delta \partial \nu)$, Grinf., Leo [miscited by De W.] It seems, however, more simple to refer mívois to the subjective faith of the apostle, $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \dot{\eta} i n$. to the objective truth of the doctrine he delivered; ' quidquid fides docet necessario est verum,' Justin. 'A入ท́શิєıa logically follows miotis, for, as the same expositor remarks, 'hæc ad illam aditum recludit;' comp. John viii. 31.
8. Boѝ $o \mu \alpha_{1}$ oरंע] ' I desire then:' 'hoc verbo exprimitur auctoritas apostolica; cap. v. 14,' Beng. In Boúдopą the active wish is implied ; it is no mere willingness or acquiescence. On the distinction between Boú入oual and N̦é $\lambda \omega$, see below on ch. v. 14, and comp. notes on Eph.i.11, and especially the clear and satisfactory discussion of Donaldson, Crutyl. §463, p. 694 sq. (ed 3).
${ }_{0} 0 \bar{\nu} \nu$ Not simply illative and in reference to ver. 7 (Calv.), but retrospective and resumptive,- recapitulating, and at the

## 

same time expanding, the desire expressed in ver. 1 ; 'in pursuance then of my general exhortation, I desire.' The proper collective force of oîv is thus not wholly lost : on the resumptive use, see Kilotz, Devar. Vol. 11. p. 718, and notes on Gial. iii. 5. $\quad \pi \rho \circ \sigma \in v \dot{\chi} \in \sigma \hat{a} a, 1$ Emphatic; bringing the subject again forward, forcibly and distinctly. The allusion, as Huther properly contends, is clearly to pubdic prayer; comp. ver. 1 . Toùs ávSpas is thus in antithesis to $\tau$ às ruvaîkas, ver. 9 , and marks, though here not with any special force, but rather allusively, the fact that the condueting of the public prayers more particularly belonged to the men; compare ver. 12, 1 Cor. xi. 4, 5. Had the apostle said $\pi$ dá $\nu$ Tas, it would not have secmed so consistent with his subsequent specific direction.
$\epsilon^{2} \nu \pi \alpha \nu \tau \boldsymbol{\ell} \delta \pi \omega$ must he limited to 'every place of customary derotional resort, everywhere where prayer is wont to be made' (Peile); compare Basil, de Bapt. i1. qu. 8. If the allusion had here been particularly to private prayer, then è $\pi \alpha \nu \tau i ̀$ tóm $\varphi$ might have been referred to the indifferency of place in regard to prayer; ' omnis locus oratorium est,' August. Serm. 130, compare Sehoettg. Ilor. Vol. 11. p. 865. This however is not conveyed by the present words. There is also no polemical reference to the limitation of public worship among the Jews to the temple (Chrys., Wolf),-a fact moreover which is not historically true; comp. Est. in loc. èraipoyтas к. т. 入.]'lifting up holy humds ;' partieipial elause, of manner or accessories (compare Jelf, Gr. §698, Winer, Gr. § 45. 2), defining both the proper bodily gesture and the spiritual qualifieations required in prayer. The Christian, as well as Pagan (Virg. LEn. 1. 93) and Jewish (1 Kings viii. 22, Ps. xxviii. 2) custom of raising aloft the
hands in prayer, is illustrated by Suicer, Thesaur. s. v. єèx $\dot{\text { ń, Vol. 11. p. 1276, }}$ Bingham, Antiq. xili. 8. 10. It was, as it were, an oblation to God of the instruments of our necessities, Chrys. in Psalm. exl. Vol. v. p. 431 (ed. Bened.). The folding together of the hands in prayer has been shown to be of Indo-Germanic origin; see Stul. u. Krit. for 1853, p. 90, and Vierordt's special treatise on the subject, Carlsr. $1851 . \quad \delta \sigma$ ious] 'hioly;' opp. to $\beta \in \beta \eta \lambda o t ~ \chi \in i p e s, 2$ Mrace. v. 16. It is singular that Winer (Gr. \$ 11. 1, p. 64) should suggest the possibility of so awkward a comnection as $\delta \sigma$ fious ('religione perfusos,' Firitz.) with ėmuip., and still more so that Fritzsche (Rom. Vol. inr. p. 1) should actually adopt it, when the common Attic use of adjectives in -cos, etc. (Elmsl. Eur. Heracl. 245) with only tuo terminations is so distinetly found in the N. T. (ver. 9; see Winer l.c.), and gives so good a sense. Contrary instances of similar 'adjectiva minus mobilia,' are collected by Lobeck, Phirgn. p. 106. Wolf cites Demosth. Mid. 531,
 reading is iotas. On the true manning of ひ̈tos (holy purity). see Harless on Ephl. iv. 24. It may be remarked that áquós, àmiavtos, and kasapos are all similarly used with $\chi$ tipes; see Clem. Rom. Cor.
 and exx. in Suicer, Thessur. s. v. éx̌n. The first term perhaps denotes freedom from (inward) impurity; the second, from stain (outwardly contracted) or pollution ; the third, from alien admixture: see Tittmann, Synon. I p. 26 sq.
$\chi$ wpis óprîs к. т. $\lambda$.] 'without (or apart from a anger and doultiny,' Auth. Ver. It does not scem proper either here or Phil. ii. 14, to import from the text a
 Vulg., and nearly all recent commentators except Meyer) unconfirmed by

## 

good lexical authority．The explanation of Chrysost．and the Greek expositors，
 ret），＇hæsitationes，＇Vulg．in Phil．l．c．，
 flein，＇Goth．，is perfectly satisfactory and in accordance with the proper meaning of the worl；compare Plato，Axioch．p．
 Clem．Rom．Cor．1．21，where it is in connection with $\grave{\epsilon} \nu \nu o \omega \omega \nu$ ；so also Clem． Alex．Strom．Iv．17，quoting from Clem． Rom．On the alleged distinction between $\chi$ wpis and ${ }^{\alpha} \nu \bar{\alpha} \nu$ ，see notes on Eph．ii． 12.

9．$\dot{\omega} \sigma \alpha$ út ws к．$\tau . \lambda_{\text {．］}}$＇（I desire）like－ wise that women also，in seemly guise，with shamefustness and discretion，do adorn themselves，＇etc．Omitting all evasive and virtually participial translations（comp． Conybeare）of the plain infinitive коб－ $\mu \in i v$ ，we have two constructions：we may either supply（ $a$ ）merely $\beta$ oúлoua， the infin．кoбueiv being simply depend－ ent on the supplied verb；or（b）Boúno－ $\mu a \iota ~ \pi \rho o \sigma \in v^{\chi} \chi \in \approx \approx a \iota$ ，the infinitival clause коб $\mu \in i \downarrow$ к．$\tau$ ．$\lambda_{\text {．，being regarded as added }}$ ＇per asyndeton＇（Mack），or with an ex－ planatory force（comp．De W．）．The main objection to $(a)$ is the less special meaning that must be assigned to $\dot{\omega} \sigma a \dot{v}-$ tws；but compare Tit．ii．3，and appy． Rom．viii．26，where $\dot{\text { © }}$ uv́cus introduces a statement co－ordinate with，but not purely similar to，what precedes ；see also 2 Macc．ii．12．The objection to（b）is the singularly unconnected position of кoбueiv：this is far less casy to surmount， for in all the instances hitherto adduced of unconnected infinitives（ch．v．14，vi． 18，Tit．iii．1）the verbs all relate to the same subject，and the construction is casy and obvious．It seems best then to adopt（ $a$ ），and to find the force of $\dot{\omega} \sigma a v^{\prime}-$ $\tau \omega s$ in the continued but implied（ver． 11）reference to public prayers ；see Bp．

Möller in loc．Kal，moreover，has thus its full and proper ascensive force ：the women were not mere supernumeraries； they also had their duties，as well as the men ；these were sobriety of deportment and simplicity of dress，at all times，espe－ cially at public prayers．It would seem almost as if the apostle intended only to allude to demeanor and dress at the lat－ ter，but concluded with making the in－ structions general．$\quad \epsilon \nu \kappa \alpha \tau \alpha-$ $\sigma \tau \circ \lambda \hat{n}$ ко $\sigma \mu \hat{\ell} \omega]$＇in seemly guise：＇ compare Tit．ii．3，ėv катабтท́patı ífoo－ $\pi \rho \in \pi \epsilon i s$ ，and see notes in loc．；not to be connected directly with $\kappa o \sigma \mu \in i v$ ，but form－ ing with $\mu \in \tau \grave{\alpha} \sigma \omega \phi \rho \circ \sigma$ ．к．$\tau . \lambda$ ．a kind of adjectival predication to be appended to ruvaikas；comp．Peile in loc，and see Matth．vi．29，Tit．i．6．Kaтaбтo入クे is not simply＇dress＇（Liddell and Scott； Lex．s．v．，Huther，al．），a meaning for which there is not satisfuctory authority， but＇deportment，＇as exhibited exter－ nally，whether in look，manner，or dress ； see Rost u．Palm，Lcx．s．v．Vol．i．p． 1655，and comp．Joseph．Bell．Jud．1． 8. 4，катабто入̀े каl $\sigma \chi \hat{\eta} \mu \alpha$ б由́भaтos，and especially Hippocr．de Dec．Habitu，1．26， where катабто入خे is associated with каэิ＇－ $\delta \rho \alpha$ and $\pi \epsilon \rho\llcorner\sigma \tau o \lambda \eta$ ，thus apparently con－ veying the idea of something outwardly cognizable，－external appearance as principally exhibited in dress ；comp．Syi．
 $\sigma \chi \eta$ भ̆ $\mu a \tau \iota$ casto vestitus］：＇guise＇thus perhaps approaches most nearly to the idea which the apostle intended to con－ vey．We cannot（with De W．）cite the Vulg．＇habitus，＇as the following epithet （ornato）seems to show that the transla－ tor referred it more definitely to＇ap－ parel．＇It would seem then not improb－ able that the glosses of Hesych．（кaтaбт． $\left.\pi \in \rho \iota \beta o \lambda \not \dot{\eta}_{\nu}\right)$ and Suidas（катабт．$\left.\cdot \sigma \tau 0 \lambda \dot{\eta} \nu\right)$ ， and the use in later writers，e．g．Basil


(see Suiccr, Thesaur. s. v. Vol. II. 65), were suggested by a doubtful interpretation of this passage.
$\kappa \circ \sigma \mu\{\varphi\}$
Only here and ch. iii. 2, and with the meaning, 'seemly,' 'becoming' (compare Goth. ' hräinjái '), — not ' ornato,' Vulg., Luther: see Suicer, Thesaur. s. v. Vol. ix. p. 147.
aiठov̂s кai
$\sigma \omega \phi \rho \circ \sigma \dot{v} \nu \eta s$ ] 'shamefastness and discretion;' the inward feeling which should accompany the outward bearing and deportmeut: both terms are found united, Arrian, Epict. Iv. 8. Aiṑs (only here; Heb xii. 28, cited by Trench, Synon. s. v, has but little critical support) marks the innate shrinking from anything unbecoming;' $\sigma \omega \not \subset \rho o \sigma$ ív (ch. ii. 15, Acts xxvi. 25), the 'well-balanced state of mind resuiting from habitual self-restraint;' comp. 4. Mace. i. 31, $\sigma \omega \phi \rho 0-$
 comprehensively, Plato, Republ. 1v. p.
 द̌үкра́т., similarly, Symp. p. 196 c, and more at length Aristotle, Ethics, iri. 13. Chrysostom is no less distinct, $\sigma \omega \phi p o \sigma$.

 Eival, on Tit. ii. 5, p. 822, see Trench, Synon. § 20, and for the most plausible translation, notes on Transl. It may be remarked that $\sigma \omega ́ \phi \rho \omega \nu$ and its derivatives (except $\sigma \omega \not \subset \rho \nu \in \hat{i}$, and, $\sigma \omega \phi p o \sigma i ́ \nu \eta$, Acts l.c.) $\sigma \omega \phi \rho o \nu i(\xi \epsilon \nu, \sigma \omega \phi \rho o \nu i \sigma \mu \delta s, \sigma \omega \phi \rho \sigma \nu \omega s$, бwфpoovivn, occur only in the Pastoral Epp This is one among mary hints, afforded by the verbal characteristics of these three Epp., that they were written by one hand [St. Paul], and probably at no distant period from one another.
$\mu \grave{\eta}$ Èv $\pi \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \gamma \mu a \sigma \iota \nu]$ 'not with plaitings:' special adornments both personal ( $\pi \lambda \epsilon$ ' $\gamma \mu$.) and put on the person ( $\chi$ pvā̂, $\mu a \rho \gamma \alpha \rho$., i $\mu a \tau І \sigma \mu \hat{\varphi})$ inconsistent with Christian simplicity ; comp. 1 Pet. iii. 3 ,

द̇ $\mu \pi \lambda o \kappa \dot{\eta} \tau \rho \iota \chi \hat{\omega} \nu$, and sec esp. Clem. Alex. Pcedag. 111. 11. 62, Vol. I. p. 290 (Pott.), ai $\pi \epsilon \rho เ \pi \lambda о к а \downarrow ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \tau \rho \iota \chi \omega ิ \nu$ ai éтaıрькаí к. $\tau . \lambda$., where this and other kinds of porsonal decoration are fully discussed ; comp. Wakef. Sylv. Crit. Vol. int. p. 133. What Clement approves of is àva-


 тàs $\sigma$ ढ̈фpovas róaas. On the subject generally, see Smith, Dict. of Antiq. Art. 'Coma,' and the plates in Montfiucon, $L^{\prime}$ Antiq. Expl. Vol. iir. p. 41, Suppl. Vol. iir. p. 44. The remarks of Beng. on this use of $\mu \grave{\eta}$ are not satisfactory ; où in peculiar forms of expression is found after $\beta$ outroual, the regular and natural particle after verbs of ' will,' is, however, of course $\mu \bar{\eta}$; see exx. in Gayler, Partic. Neg. p. 329 sq
 Pet. iii. 3; ear-rings, necklaces, bracelets, comp. Pliny, Nat. Hist. 1x. 35.
 which becometh women professing (not " who profess," Alf.) godliness.' The construc-
 may be joined with $\mathrm{e}^{2 \pi a \gamma \gamma e \lambda \lambda \text {. (Vulg., }}$ Theod.) ; in which case the rel. of must be regarded as equivalent to ėv тoúrê ő (Matth.), or кas' \%'(Huth.), -both somewhat unsatisfactory explanations. It seems much more simple to connect $\delta i$ ${ }_{\epsilon} \rho \gamma$. $\dot{\alpha} \gamma$. with $\kappa о \sigma \mu$ eiv (Syr., Theophyl.),
 relatival opposition ; see Winer, Grr. § 23. 2, p. 143, note. The objection of Huther to коб $\mu \mathrm{eiv}$ - $\delta$ ì̀ is not of moment: ̆̈ppa à $\gamma a s a ̀$ were the medium of the rófuos; the prevenient and attendant graces of soul (comp. 1 Pet. iii. 3.) were its actual constituents. $\quad \bar{\epsilon} \pi a \gamma-$ $\gamma \in \lambda \lambda \circ \mu \epsilon ́ \nu a t \dot{s}]$ 'professing,' 'profitentes,' ' prex se ferentes,' Justin. ; comp.

A woman must learn and not teach, for two reasons ; she was second in respect of creation, and first in respect of transgression.


 Clarom., Goth., al. ; Cypr., Ambrst., Jerome (much appr. by Griesb., De Wette, Huther, Wirsiny.). It is difficult to mederstand what principle except that of opptosition to Lachm. has induced Tisch. (ed. 2, 7) to adopt the reading of the Rec. $\gamma v$ $\nu$ vaki $\delta \epsilon \in \delta \iota \delta \alpha ́ \sigma \kappa \epsilon \iota \nu$, with KL ; great majority of mss. ; Syr. (both), Theod.-MLops., Chrys, Theod., Dam., al.; Ambr. (Mill, Scholz, Alf.), when the uncial authority is thus noticeahly weak, and the context so plainly favors the reading of the text. The $\delta \dot{\epsilon}$ is not for $\gamma \alpha{ }^{\alpha}$ (Syr.), and has certainly no 'vim copulativum' ( $=$ 'scilicet,' Len), hut properly, and with its usual antithetical force, marks the opposition to $\mu a \nu \nexists a \nu \epsilon ́ \tau \omega$.
ch. vi. 21, where this meaning is perfectly clear. Huther compares Xenoph.

 Philo, de Luman. § 1, Vol. 1ı. p. 384
 $\pi \in i a v$, and see further exx. in Suicer, Thesuur. s. v. Vol. 1. 1. 1157. Өєобє́$\beta \in \iota \alpha$, an $\dot{\alpha} \pi$. $\lambda \in \gamma 0 \mu$., scarcely differs in sense from єv̀ซє́ $\beta \in \iota a$, ver. 2 ; compare notes.
11. $\left.\gamma \nu \nu \nu_{i}^{\prime}\right]$ ' $a$ woman,' i.e. any one of the class, or, in accordance with the idiom of our language (Brown, Grumm. of Gr. 11. 2. obs. 6, p. 220), 'the woman,' see notes on Eph. v. 23.
$\dot{\epsilon} \nu$ रो $\sigma \nu \chi i \underline{a}]$ 'in quiet,' scil. 'without speaking or attempting to teach in the


$\mu \alpha \nu \vartheta a \nu \in ́ T \omega$ ] 'learn, 'i.e. at the public ministrations; in antithesis to $\delta \delta \delta \dot{\alpha} \sigma \kappa$., rer. 12. It is obvious that the apostle's previous instructions, 1 Cor. xir. 31 sq ., are here again in his thoughts The renewal of the prohibition in Concil. Carth. Iv. Can. 99 (A. D. 398), would seem to show that a neglect of the apostolic ordinance had crept into the African Church. Wromen were permitted, however, to teach privately those of their own sex, ib. Can. 12 ; see Bingham, Antiq. xIv 45.
$\dot{\epsilon} \nu \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \sigma \dot{\cup} \pi 0^{-}$ Tar? ]] 'in all subjection,' i. e. yiclding it
in all cases, not 'in voller Unterordnung,' Huther' ; aûs being extensive rather than intensive: see notes on Eph. i. 8. On the position occupied by women in the early Church, it may be remarked that Christianity did not abrogate the primal law of the relation of woman to man. While it animated and spiritualized their fellowship, it no less definitely assigned to them their respective spheres of action; teaching and preaching to men, ' mental receptivity and activity in family life to women,' Neander, Planting, Vol. I. p. 147 (Bohn). What grave arguments these few verses supply us with against some of the unnatural and unscriptural theories of modern times.
12. $\delta \iota \delta \alpha \sigma \kappa \in L \nu \delta \epsilon ́]$ Opposition to $\mu a \nu$ ה̊avé́т $\omega$ ver. 11 , see critical note. $\Delta t-$ סá $\sigma \kappa$ elv is cmphatic, as its position shows; it does not, however, follow, as the Montanists maintained from 1 Cor. xiv. 5 , that a woman might $\pi \rho o ф \eta \tau \in$ vél in public. Every form of public address or teaching is clearly forbidden as at variance with woman's proper duties and destination : see Neander, Planting, l.c. note. Wolf cites Democrates, Sentent. [ap. Gale, Scripı. M1yth.] үuvì $\mu \grave{\eta}$ à $\sigma \kappa \epsilon$ ít $\omega$ $\lambda o \gamma o \nu, \delta \epsilon \iota \nu \partial \nu \nu \alpha$ 人́p.
$a \dot{v} \hat{\mathcal{L}} \in \nu \tau \in \hat{\imath} \nu]$ ' to exercise dominion; ,
 super] Syr.; not 'to usurp authority,'



Auth. Ver., a further meaning not con-
 rou. in N. T.), found only in lato and cecl. writers (Basil, Epist. 52), involves the secondary and less proper meaning. of aìṡévtทs (Lobeck, Pliryn. p. 120, but comp. Eur. Suppl. 442), scil. $\delta \in \sigma \pi \sigma$ órทs,

 curs 3 Macc. ii. 29 ; see Suicer, Thesaur. Vol. 1. p. 573, where verb, adj., and subst. are explained and illustrated. The immediate context shows that the primary reference of the prohibition is to public ministration (Beng.) ; the succeeding arguments, however, demonstrate it to be also of universal application. On this sulbject see the bricf but satisfactory remarks of Harless, Ethil, \$ 5 2, note, p. 279. $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda^{\prime} \in\lceil\nu \alpha \iota \kappa . \tau . \lambda$. 'but to be in quiet, i. e. in silence;' infin. dependant on Boú入opat or some similar verb (not $\kappa \in \lambda \epsilon \dot{v} \omega$, which St. Paul does not use), to be supplied from оэ̉к èлเтрє́та: so 1 Cor. xiv. 34 ; comp. 1 Tim. iv. 3 , Herm. Soph. Electr. 72. This form of brachylogy occurs most commonly in the case of an antithesis (as here), introduced by an adversative conjunction, Jelf, Gr. $\S 895$. h. The antithesis between each member of this and of verse 11 is very marked.
13. 'A $\delta \grave{\alpha} \mu \gamma{ }^{\alpha} \rho$ ] First confirmation of the foregoing command, derived from the Creation. The argument from priority of creation, to be complete, requires the subsidiary statement in 1 Cor. xi. 9,
 $\gamma u v \grave{\eta}$ ôıà $\tau \delta \nu \nu \check{\alpha} \nu \delta \rho a$ : comp. Est. The remarks of Reuss, Théel. Chret. Vol. II. p. 210 , note, are unguarded ; there is here no 'dialectique, Judäique,' but a simple and direct declaration, under the influence of the Holy Spirit, of the typical meaning of the order observed in the
creation of man and woman.
'่ $\pi \lambda \alpha \sigma \hat{\eta} \eta$ ] 'was formed, fashioned;' proper and specific word, as in Hesiod, Op, 70, ėк زaîŋs $\pi \lambda \alpha ́ \sigma \sigma \epsilon$ : comp, also

 रोिs : so Joseph. Antiq. 1. 1, 1.
14. $\kappa \alpha{ }^{\prime}$ ' $A \delta \alpha \mu$ ] Second confirmation, deduced from the history of the fall: - docet apostolus feminas oportere esse viris subjectas, quia et posteriores sunt in ordine et priores in culpà,' Primas, cited by Cornel. a Lap, in loc.
o $\dot{\cup} \kappa \eta \pi \alpha \tau \eta\{\eta$ ] There is no necessity whatever to supply лрw̄тos, Theodoret, Ceum. 1. The emphasis rests on $\mathfrak{a} \pi \alpha-$ $\tau \hat{\alpha} \nu$. Adam was not directly deceived, Eve was ; she says to God, $\delta$ uै $\phi$ ıs $\bar{\eta} \pi \alpha^{-}$
 àmठ̀ toû छ̧ú̀ov, kal є̌фaүov. We can hardly urge with Beng., 'mulier virum non decepit sed ei persuasit, Gcn. iii. 17,' for it can scarcely be doubted that the woman did deceive the man (compare Chrys.), being in fact, in her very persuasions, the vehicle of the serpent's deceit : it is, however, the first entrance of $\sin$ which the apostle is specially regarding; this came by the means of the serpent's àmát $\eta$; Eive directly succumbed to
 24), Adan only indirectly and derivatively. Hence observe in Gen. iii. the order of the three parties in the promulgation of the sentence ; the serpent (ver. 14), woman (ver. 16), man (ver. 17). According to the Rabbinical writers (Schoettg. Mor. Vol. I. p. 867), Eve was addressed, because it was very doubtful whether man would have yielded.
'̇ $\xi \alpha \pi \alpha \tau \eta$ ज $\in \hat{i} \sigma \alpha]$ 'being completely, patently deceived.' The reading, which is supported by ADiFG; 17, al. (Lachm., Tisch.); seoms to confirm the foregoing explanation. To preclude apparently

 $\sigma \omega \phi$ робúv $\eta$ s.
any misconception of his meaning, the apostle adds a strengthened compound, which serves both to show that the moment of thought turns on à $\pi \alpha \alpha_{\alpha} \omega$, and also to define tacitly the limitation of meaning under which it is used. The prep. ék here conveys the idea of completion, thoroughness, Rost u. Palm, Lex. s. v. $\epsilon \kappa$, Vol. I. p. 820 . 'H $\gamma u v \grave{\eta}$ is here clearly 'the woman,' i.e. Eve, not the sex generally (Chrysost.). The generic meaning comes out in the next verse. Eve was the typical representative of the race.
$\dot{\epsilon} \nu \pi \alpha \rho a \beta \dot{\alpha} \sigma \in t$ $\gamma \in \dot{\gamma} \gamma \quad \nu \in \nu]$ 'became involved in transgression,' 'fell into transgression ;' the constr. خiveaテal $\dot{\epsilon} \nu$ occurs occasionally (but not 'frequently' Huther) in the N. T. (e. g.
 Acts xxii. 17 ; $\epsilon^{\prime} \nu \delta \delta \xi \eta, 2$ Cor. iii. 7 ; $\epsilon \nu$
 1 Thess. ii. 5) to denote the entrance into, and existence in, any given state. On the distinction between Eival (esse) and $\gamma$ iveãau (existere et evenire), see Fritz. Fritzsch. Opusc. p. 284, note.
15. $\sigma \omega \hat{n} \dot{\eta} \sigma \in \tau \alpha 4 \quad \delta \dot{\epsilon}]$ ' yet she shall be saved;' not merely ' eripietur e noxâ illà,' (Beng.), but in its usual proper and scriptural sense, 'ad vitam æternam perducetur ; ' comp. Suicer, Thesaur. s. v. Vol. 11. p. 1206. The translation of Peile (founded on the tense), 'shall be found to have been saved,' is somewhat artificial ; see notes on Gal. ii. 16. The tense here only marks simple futurity. The nom. to $\sigma \omega$ Nin $\sigma \in \tau \alpha l$ is $\gamma v \nu \dot{\eta}$, in its generic sense; oủ $\pi \epsilon \rho$ l $\tau \hat{\eta} s$ Eưas है $\phi \eta$,
 This is confirmed by the use of the plural, ส̀à $\mu \in \mathfrak{\ell} \nu \omega \sigma t \nu \kappa$ к. т. $\lambda$., see below.
$\delta \iota \alpha \dot{\alpha} \tau S \tau \in \kappa \nu$ orovias] 'by means of tue child-bearing.' Setting aside all untenable or doubtful interpretations of סià
('in' Beza, 'cum' Rosenm.) and $\tau \epsilon \kappa \nu 0^{-}$रovias (=тéкva, Syriac ; тò кат̀̀ Өєò̀ [テє́кขa] àvaүarєì, Chrys., Fell, compare Stier, Red. Jes. Vol. I11. p. 13 ; 'matrimonium,' Heinsius), we have two explanations; (a) 'by child-bearing;' by fulfilling her proper destiny and acquiescing in all the conditions of woman's lifo, Beng., De Wette, Huther, al. ; compare Neander, Planting, Vol. 1. p. 341 (Bohn): $(\beta)$ 'by the child-bearing,' i. e. by the relation in which woman stood to the Messiah, in consequence of the primal prophecy that 'her seed (not man's) should bruise the serpent's head ' (Gen. iii. 16), Hammond, Peile: 'the peculiar function of her sex (from its relation to her Saviour) shall be the medium of her salvation.' This latter interpretation has but few supporters, and has even been said, though scarcely justly, to need no refutation (Alf.); when, however, we consider its extreme appropriateness, and the high probability that the apostle in speaking of woman's transgression, would not fail to specify the sustaining prophecy which preceded her sentence; - when we add to this the satisfactory meaning which סiò thus bears, - the uncircumscribed reference of $\sigma \omega \uparrow \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \tau \alpha \iota$ (opp. De W., Alf.), - the force of the article (passed over by most expositors), - and, lastly, observe the coldness and jejuneness of $(\alpha)$, it seems difficult to avoid deciding in favor of $(\beta)$ : sce the clear and satisfactory note of Hammond, and we may now add of Wordsw. in loc. ' $\alpha \nu \nu \in\{\nu \omega \sigma \iota \nu]$ 'if they should continue,' scil. ai $\gamma \dot{\nu a i n \epsilon \in s, ~ o r ~ r a t h e r ~} \dot{\eta} \gamma \nu \nu \dot{\eta}$, taken in its collective sense; see Winer, Gr § 58. 4, p. 458 : a necessary limitation of the previous declaration; $\dot{\eta}$ teкעоб. of itself could effect nothing. The plural is referred by Chrysost. and Syr. [as
 ble morals, a good father of his family, and of good report.
shown by the masc. termination] to $\tau$ tékva, this is grammatically admissible (see Winer, Gr. § 67. 1, p. 555), but exegetically unsatisfactory. On the use of è̀ $v$ with subjunetive (oljective possibility; ' experience will show whether they will athide'), see Hermann, de Partic. áv, ir. 7, p. 97, and notes on Gal. i. 8. In applying these principles, however, it must always be remembered that in the N. T. the use of tà $\begin{aligned} & \text { with subj. has nearly en- }\end{aligned}$ tirely absorbect that of ei with the opt.; see Green, Gr. p. 53.
$\pi i \sigma \tau \in 1 \kappa \alpha \mathrm{~d} \gamma \mathrm{\gamma}$.] 'in faith and love;' sphere in which they were to continue. On the union of these terms, and the omission, but of course virtual inclusion, of è $\lambda \pi i s$, compare Renss, Thiél. Chrét. iv. 22, Vol. 11. p. 259. חíctus here appropriately points, not to 'eheliche 'Trene,' Huth., but to faith in the cardinal promise. $\left.\kappa \alpha \alpha^{\prime} \dot{\alpha} \gamma / \alpha \sigma \mu \hat{\omega}\right]$ 'and holiness.' 'La sanctification est done l'état normal du croyant, Rom. vi. 22, 1 Thess. iv. 3 sq.;' Reuss. Thieol. Cliret. iv. 16, Yol. м1. p. 167. On $\sigma \omega \phi \rho o \sigma=v_{v} \eta$, see notes on ver. 9 .

Citapter III. 1. $\pi / \sigma \tau \delta s \delta \quad \lambda \delta$ $\gamma \circ s]$ ' Fuitliful is the saying.' 'Hâc velutı prefatiunculâ attentionem captat,' Justin. Chrysostom refers this to what hias preecded (compare ch. iv. 9); the context, however, secms clearly to sugyest that, as in ch. i. 15 , the reference is to what finllours. The reading àvopómtros ( 1 ) and a feev Latt. Vr.) is of course of no critical value, but is interesting as seeming to hint at a Latin origin. In ch. i. 15, 'humanus' is found in a few Lat. Vr. (see Sabatier), where it was probably a reading, or rather gloss, ad sensim (hum. $=$ benignus). From that passage it was ignorantly and unsuitably imported here into some Lat. $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$., and
thence perhaps into the important Cod. Claromont. Charges of Latinisms (though by no means fully sustained), will be found in the Edinburgl Review, No. cxcr.; see Tregelles, Printed Text of N. T. p. $199 \mathrm{sq} . \quad$ ' $\pi / \sigma$ $\kappa 0 \pi \hat{\eta} s]$ 'office of a bishop.' Without entering into any discussion upon the origin of episcopacy generally, it seems proper to remark that we must fairly acknowledge with Jerome (Epist. is, ad Ocean. Vol. iv. p. 648), that in the Pastoral Epp. the terms èmionootos and $\pi \rho \epsilon \sigma$ Búrepos are applied indifferently to the same persons ; Pearson, Vind. Ign. xiri. p. 535 (A. C. L.), Thorndike, Gov. of Churches, rir. 3, Vol. I. p. 9 (ib.). The first was borrowed from the Greeks (oi

 Suidas, s. v. èmiok., Dion. IIal. Antiq. 11. 76 ; see Hooker, Eccl. Pol. vir. 2. 2, and exx. in Elsner, Ots. Vol. xr. p. 293), and pointed to the office on the side of its duties: the second, which marked primarily the age of the occupant, was taken from the Jews (Hamm. on Acts xi. 30 ), and pointed to the office on the side of its gravity and dignity ; comp. 1 Peter v. 1, and see Neander, Planting, Vol. I. p. 143 (Bohn). While this cannot be denied, it may be fairly urged on the other hand,- (1) that the iroovvouía of the two words in the N. T. appears of this kind, that while $\pi \rho \epsilon \sigma \beta \dot{\tau} \tau \rho \rho o s$, conjointly with ìiiซкoтos, refers to what was subsequently the higher order, it is rarely used in the N. T. (comp. James v. 14 ?) to denote specially what was subsequently the lower; comp. Hammond, Dissert. iv. 6, Vol. iv. p. 799 sq. ; to which may be added that in the second century no one of the lower order was ever termed an ėтímotos (Pearson, Vind. Ign. ch. xiII. 2); and (2) that there are indelible

traces in the N . T. of an office (by whatever name called, ä $\gamma \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \in \lambda o s, \kappa . \tau . \lambda$.) which, possibly, first arising from a simple $\pi \rho 0-$ єôpía in a board of $\pi \rho \in \sigma \beta$ út $\epsilon \rho \frac{1}{\text { (comp. }}$ Jerome on Tit. i. 5, Vol. Iv. p. 413, ed. Ben.) grew under apostolic sanction and by apostolic institution into that of a single definite rulership 'over a whole borly ecelesiastical;' see esp. Blunt, Sketch of the Church, Serm. I. p. 7 sq., and comp. Saravia, de Divers. Giad. ch. x. p. 11 sq. We may conclude by observing that the subsequent official distinction between the two orders (traces of which may be observed in these Epp.) has nowhere been stated more ably than by Bp. Bilson, as consisting in two prerogatives of the bishop, 'singularity in succeeding, and superiority in ordaining,' Perpet. Gov. xirx. p. 334 sq. Oxf. 1842). Of the many treatises written on the whole subject, this latter work may be especially recommended to the student. Bilson is, indeed. as Pearson (Vind. Ign. ch. III.) truly says, ' vir magni in ecelesiầ nominis.' $\quad$ b $p \in ́ \gamma \in \tau ;<]$ 'seeketh after:' there is no idea of 'ambitious seeking' (De W.) couched in this word; it seems only to denote the definite character, and perhaps manifestation, of the desire, the 'stretching out of the hands to receive,' whether in a good (Heb. xi. 16), or in a bad (chap. vi. 10) application; compare Wieseler, Chironol. p. 301 , note.

E'prov] 'worl: :' not 'bonam rem,' Castal., but definitely 'function,' 'occupation ;' comp. 2 Tim. iv. 5, and see notes on Eph. iv. 12. On the sulyject of this and the following verses, see a discourse hy Bp. Kennett (Lond. 1706).
2. $o \hat{b} \nu$ ] 'then; ' continuation slightly predominating over retrospect; comp. Donalds. Gr. §604. The proper collective sense of this particle (Klotz, Devar. Vol. 11. p. 717) may, however, be clearly
traced in the refererice to the foregoing words, к $\alpha \lambda o \hat{v}$ épyou: so acutely Bengel, 'bonum negotium bonis committendum.' $\tau \delta \nu \epsilon ่ \pi[\sigma \kappa \circ \pi \circ \nu]$ 'every bishop' or (according to our idiom) 'a bishop;' the article is not due so much to the impli-
 comp. Green, Gr. p. 140), as to the generic way in which the sulject is pret sented; comp. Middleton, Art. i11. 2. 1, notes on Gal. iii. 20.
Iluther here calls attention to two facts in relation to ėmiok. (1) That except here and Tit. i. 7, St. Paul only uses the term once, Phil. i. 1; we ought perhaps to add Acts xx. 28 : (2) That the singular is used here, and still more noticeably in Tit. l. c. where $\pi \rho \in \sigma \beta u{ }^{\tau} \tau \in \rho o t$ had just preceded. Of these two points, (1) seems referable to a later date, as well as to the different sulject of these Epp.; (2) to the desire of the apostle to give his instructions their broadest application by this generic use of the article.
$\dot{\alpha} \nu \in \pi\{\lambda \eta \mu \pi \tau \circ \nu\}$ 'irreproachable; 'inreprehensibilem,' Vulgate, Clarom.; ă $\mu є \mu \pi \tau о \nu$, àката́ $\gamma \nu \omega \sigma \tau о \nu$, Hesych., There seems no authority for regarding $\dot{\alpha} \nu \in \pi i \lambda$. as 'an agonistic term' (Blomf., Peile); it appears only used in an ethical sense, as 'qui nullum in agendo locum dat rep)rehensionis' (Tittm. ; $\mu \grave{\eta} \pi \alpha \rho \epsilon ́ \chi \omega \nu$ катєropías àфopù̀ц, Schol. Thucyd. v. 17), and differs from ăa $\mu \mu \pi \tau o s$ as implying, not 'qui non reprehenditur,' but 'qui non dignus est reprehensione, etiamsi reprehendatur;' see Tittm. Synon. 1. p. 30. Hence its union with $\begin{aligned} & \\ & \sigma \\ & \pi\end{aligned} \lambda o s, \mathrm{ch}$. vi. 14 , and with karapos, Lucian, Pisc. 8 ; comp. Polyb. Hist. xxx. 7. 6, where, however, the sense seems simply privative : see further exx. in Elsner, and Suicer, Thesaur. s. v.
$\mu \iota a ̂ s$ үvvatкòs 九̌vopa] 'a husband of one wife.' 'These much-contested words have been explained in three ways ;
$\lambda \eta \mu \pi \tau 0 \nu$ єîval, $\mu \iota a ̂ s ~ \gamma v \nu a \iota \kappa o ̀ s ~ a ̈ \nu \delta \rho a, ~ \nu \eta \phi a ́ \lambda \iota o v, ~ \sigma o ́ \phi \rho o v a, ~ \kappa o ́ \sigma \mu \iota o v, ~$
(a) in reference to any deviation from morality in respect of marriage, 'whether by concubinage, polygamy, or improper second marriages ' [comp. 1 Cor. vii. 2], Matthies ; so appy. Theodoret, $\tau \delta \nu \mu \hat{\alpha}$
 contemporancous polygamy, which at that time still seems to have prevailed among the Jews, Joseph. Ant. xvif. 1. 2, $\pi$ d́t-
 Justin Mart. Trypho, § 134: so Calvin, Bengel, al.: (c) successive polygamy, whether (a) specially, after divorce, Hamm., Suicer (Thesaur. s. v. ठırauia); or ( $\beta$ ) generally, after loss of first wife, however happening, Fell, and appy. Huth., Wiesing., al. Of these ( $a$ ) is clearly too undefined; (b) is in opposition to the corresponding expression in ch. v. 9; $(c, a)$ is plausible, but when we consider the unrestrictedness of the formula, the opinions of the most ancient writers (Hermas, Past. Mand. Iv., Tertull. de Monogam. cap. 12, Athenagoras, Legat. p. 37, ed. Morell, 1636, Origen, in Lut cam, xvir. Vol. III.' p. 953, ed. Delarue; see Heydenr. p. 166 sq., Coteler's note on Herm. l. c. ), 一 the decisions of some councils, e. g. Neocers. (A. D. 314) Can. 3,7 , and the guarded language of even Laod. (A. D. 363?) Can. 1,-the hint afforded by paganism in the case of the woman (' 'univira '), - and lastly, the propriety in the particular cases of èiтокото and סúákovo (ver. 8) of a greater temper-
 ifestation of that $\pi \epsilon \rho \mathrm{l} \boldsymbol{\tau} \nu \nu$ èva $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \mu о \nu \sigma \epsilon \mu \nu \delta^{-}$ т $\eta$ s (Clem. Alex. Strom. ini. 1, Vol. r. p. 511, Potter), which is not umnoticed in Scripture (Luke ii. 36, 37), we decide in favor of ( $c, \beta$ ), and consider the apostle to reclare the contraction of a second marriage to be a disqualification for the office of an ėтібкотоs, or $\delta$ dákovos. The position of Bretschn:, that the text implies a bishop should be married (so Maurice, Unity,
p. 632], does not deserve the confutation of Winer, Gr. § 18. 9, p. 107, note. $\nu \eta \phi \alpha \dot{\alpha} / 0 \nu]$ 'sober,'- either in a metaphorical sense ( $\sigma \dot{\omega} \varphi \rho \omega \nu$, Suidas), as the associated epithets and the use of $\nu \eta \phi \phi \omega$ in good Greek (e. g.) Xenoph. Convic. virr. 21) will certainly warrant, or perhaps more probably (as $\mu \grave{\eta} \pi$ dápouvov, ver. $^{\text {a }}$. 3 , is not a mere synonym, see notes) in its usual and literal meaning. N'́hфelv
 deed occurs six times in the N. T. (1 Thess. v. 6, 8, 2 Tim. iv. 5, 1 Pet. i. 13, iv. 7, v. 8 ), and in all, except perhaps 1 Thess. l.c., is used metaphorically ; as however the adj. both in ver. 11 (see notes) and appy. Tit. ii. 2 is used in its literal meaning, it scems better to preserve that meaning ${ }^{\text {in }}$ in the present case ; so De W., but doubtfully, for see ib. on Tit. l. c. Under any circumstances the derivative translation 'vigilant,' Auth.
 possibly defensible in the verb (sce Etym. M. s. v. ví $\phi \epsilon t \nu$ ), is needlessly and doultfully wide of the primary meaning: on the derivation see notes on 2 Tim. iv. 5 . $\sigma \omega \phi \rho o \nu a, \kappa \delta \sigma \mu t o \nu]$ ' sober-minded or discreet, orderly.' The second epithet here points to the outward exhibition of the inward virtue implied in the first, -
 Tर̂s $\psi u \chi$ йs $\sigma \omega \phi \rho o \sigma i v \eta \eta \nu$, Theodoret: sce notes on chap. ii. 9. On фıiスógevov, see notes on Tit. i. $8 . \quad \delta \iota \delta a \kappa \tau \iota \kappa \delta \nu]$ ' apt to teach,' Auth. Ver., ' 'lehrhaftis,' Luther; not only' 'able to teach.' (Theod.; comp. Tit: i. 9), but, in accorlance with the connection in 2 Tim. ii. 24, 'ready to teach, 'skilled in teaching,'

 zoriv, Theophyl. ; see Suicer, Thesaur. s. v. Vol. I. p. 900 , comp. Hofmann, Schrifft. Vol. II 2, p. 253. On the qual-



itative termination $-k d s$ ，see Donalds． Cratyl．§ 254，p． 454.
3．$\pi$ \＆́potvo $\nu$ ］＇violent over wine，＇Tit． i． 7 ；not simply synonymous with $\phi$ iरol－ $\nu 0 \nu$ or with oไ $\omega \omega$ $\pi 0 \lambda \lambda \hat{\varphi} \pi \rho \circ \sigma \epsilon \in \chi 0 \nu \tau \alpha$, ch． iii． 8 （Ziegler，de Episc．p．350），but in－ cluding drunkenness and its manifesta－ tions：so apparently Syr．＂H．${ }^{\nabla}$ ；－ e $^{\circ}$ $i_{i}^{\circ}$ es［＇a transgressor over wine，＇ Bhherilge，not＇sectator vini，＇Schataf； see Michaelis in Cast．Lex．，and compare Heb．x．28］；comp．Chrys．，т $\tau \dot{\nu} \dot{v} \beta \rho \iota \sigma-$ $\tau \eta \nu, \tau \delta \nu \alpha u ̀ s \alpha \alpha ́ \eta \eta$ ，who，however，puts too much out of sight the origin，oivos： comp．тapoívos Arist．Acharn．981，and the copious lists of examples in Krebs， Obs．p．352，Loesner，Obs．p．396．The simple state is marked by $\mu$ énvoros（ 1 Cor．v．11，vi．10），the exhibitions of it
耳í $\gamma^{\prime} \in \tau \alpha$, Athen．x．§ 62，p． 444.
$\pi \lambda$ भ́кт $\quad \nu$ ］＇$a$ striker，＇Tit．i． 7 ；one of the specific exhibitions of mapotvía．Chrys－ ost．and Theodoret（comp．also Kypke， Obs．Vol．II．p．356）give this word too wide a reference（ $\pi \lambda \eta \dot{\eta} \tau \tau \epsilon \iota \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \grave{\alpha} \delta \epsilon \lambda \phi \omega \bar{\nu}$ $\tau \eta ̀ \nu$ $\sigma v \nu \epsilon(\delta \eta \sigma \iota \nu)$ ．Its connection both here and in Tit．l．c．certainly seems to suggest the simple and strict meaning； seo Suicer，Thesaur．s．v Vol．Ix．p．751， where both meanings are noticed．
$\dot{\epsilon} \pi i \in i \kappa \hat{\eta}, \not \subset \mu \alpha \chi \circ \nu]$＇forbearing，not con－ tentious，＇Tit．iii．2，but in a reversed order；generic opposites to the two pre－ ceding terms．The force of दोगtetkクेs is here illustrated by the associated adj．； the áraqos is the man who is not aggres－ sive（Beng．on Tit l．c．）or pugnacious， who does not contend；the ėmuturोs goes further，and is not only passively non－ contentious，but actively considerate and forbearing，waving even just and legal

$\nu$ д́ $\mu$ ò $\operatorname{Bo\eta } \eta \grave{\partial} \delta \nu$ ，Aristot．Nicomach．Eth．v． 14 The latter word is also illustrated by Trench，Synonyms，§ 43，but observe that the derivation is not from eǐк $\omega$ ，but from єikós；see Rost u．Palm，Lex．s．v． $\dot{\alpha} \phi\llcorner\lambda \alpha \rho \gamma v \rho \circ \nu]$＇not a lover of money；＇ only here and Heb．xiii．5．This epithet is not under the vinculum of $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha}$ ，but is co－ordinate with the first two negatived predicates，and perhaps has a retrospec－ tive reference to $\phi \iota \lambda \dot{\xi} \xi \in v o v$（＇Theophyl．）． On the distinction between $\phi$ i $\lambda a p \gamma u p i ́ a$ （＇avarice＇）and $\pi \lambda \in o \nu \in \xi$ 角（＇covetous－ ness＇），seo Trench，Synon．§ 24.

4．isiou］＇his own；＇emphatic，and in prospective antithesis to $\Theta \in o \hat{v}$ ，ver． 5 On the use of $\% \delta$ os in the N．T．，see notes on Eph．v．22，and on its derivation（from pronoun そ），comp．Donaldson Cratyl．§ 139， 152.
$\dot{\epsilon} \nu \dot{v} \pi$ o $\tau \alpha \gamma \hat{\eta}$ is not to be connected closely with é $\chi$ ovra （Matth．），but appended to ě $\chi$ оута тéкขa， and is thus a kind of adjectival clause， specifying the moral sphere in which they were to move：see Tit．i．6，comp． 1 Tim．ii．9，Matth．vi．29，al．If the part．had been used，though the meaning would have been nearly the same，the idea presented to the mind would have been different：in the one case suljection would have been noticed as a kind of at－ tribute，in the present case it is represent－ ed as the moral clement with which they were surrounded．The transition from actual（Luke vii．25）to figurative environ－ ment（Matth．l．c．），and thence to deport－ ment（ch．ii．9），or，as here，to moral con－ ditions seems easy and natural．$\mu \in \tau \grave{\alpha}$ $\pi \alpha \sigma \eta s$ к．$\tau . \lambda$.$] ＇with all gravity ：＇closely$ connected with $\mathfrak{v} \pi o \tau .$, specifying the atten－ dant grace with which their obedience was to be accompanied；see notes on ch．ii． 2 ．

5．єi $\delta \epsilon \in \notin$ ．．．．ovк oit $\epsilon$ ］＇but if any man knows not（how）；＇contrasted paren－


thetical clause (Winer, Gr. § 53. 2, p. 401) serving to establish the reasonableness and justice of the requisition, $\tau o \hat{v}$ iōiou $\kappa$ т. $\lambda$. ;. the argument, as Huther observes, is 'a minori ad majus.' It is perhaps scarcely nccessary to remark that there is no irregularity in the present use of $\epsilon i$ où : ' où arctissime conjungi cum verbo [not always necessarily a verb; compare Schafer, Demosth. Vol. 111. p 288/ debet, ita ut hoe verbo conjunctum unam notionem constituat, cujusmodi est oùk oīo nescio,' Hermann, Viger, No. 309. This seems more simple than to refer it here, with Green, (Gr. p. 119), to any especial gravity or earnestness of tone. The nse of $\epsilon i$ ou in the N T. is noticeably frequent; see exx. in Winer, G'r. § 59 6, p. 568 sq., and for a copious list of exx., principally from later writers, Gayler, Part. Neg. v.
 'can he take charge;' ethical future, involving the notion of 'ability,' 'possibility;' $\pi \hat{\omega} \mathrm{S} \delta \nu \nu \grave{\eta} \not \mathrm{\epsilon} \tau a t$, Chrysost.; see Winer, Gir §40.6, p. 250, Thiersch, de Pent. 111. 11. d, p. 159, and notes on
 'curam gerere,' scil. 'saluti alicujus prospiscere ' Bretschn. ; comp. Luke x. 35), are cited by Raphel in loc.
$6 \mu \grave{\eta} \nu \in o ́ \phi \nu \tau o \nu]$ ' not a recent con-
 Tìs $\pi \in \pi / \sigma \tau \epsilon v \kappa \dot{j} \tau \alpha$, Theodoret), rendered somewhat paraphrastically in Syriac
 the word is copiously illustrated by Suicer, Thesaur. Vol. r. p. 394. This and the following qualification are not specified in the parallel passage, Tit. i. 6 sq.: there is, howveyer, surely no renson for drawing from the present restriction any unfavorable inferences against the authenticity of this Ep.; see Schlcierm.
über 1 Tim. p 46. If the later date of the Ep. be admitted, Christianity would have been long enough establistied at Ephesus to make such a regulation natural and easy to be complied with : see Wiesing. in loc.
$\tau \cup \phi \omega \uparrow \in(s]$ 'besotted, or clouded, with prude;' only here, ch. vi. 4, and 2 Tim. iii. 4. Both the derivation [Өrn-, $\tau \dot{\varphi} \phi \omega$, Benfey, Vol. 11. p. 275, less probably $\tau \cup \phi$ ©́s, IIarpocr. 175, 16] and the combinations in which خu申ów is used (e. g. P'olyb. Hist. III. 81.

 ib. Phil. 111. 116, $\lambda \eta p \epsilon \overline{i \nu}$ каl $\tau \epsilon \tau v \varphi \bar{\omega} \sigma \hat{\imath}$ au; Lucian, Nıgrın. 1, àvoŋ́rov $\tau \epsilon$ каi $\tau \epsilon \tau v-$ $\phi \omega_{\mu}$ évov, etc.) seem to show that the idea of a 'beclouded' and 'stupid' state of mind must be associated with that of pride. Obnubilation, however produced, seems the primary notion ; that produced by pride or vanity ( $\kappa \in v o \delta o \xi ̧ \eta ँ \sigma a s, ~ C o r a y) ~$ the more usual application: so Hesy-
 comp. Pliilo, Mieyr. Abrah. § 24 , Vol. I. p. 457 (ed. Mang.), тúфоv каһ àmaıঠevбías

$\left.\kappa \rho i \mu \alpha \tau о \hat{v} \delta \iota \_\beta \delta \delta \lambda o v\right]$ ' 'judgment of the devil.' The meaning of these words is somewhat doubtful. As $\kappa \hat{p} \mu \mathrm{\mu}$, though never per se anything else than julicium, will still admit of some modification in meaning from the context (comp. Fritz. Rom. ii. 3, Vol. I. p 94), ס́aßbiou may be cither (a) gen. subjecti, 'the accusing judgment of the devil' (Matth., Huther) ; or (b) gen. oljecti, ' the judgment passed upon the deril.' In the former case крîua has more the meaning of 'criminatio' (Beza), in the latter of 'condemnatio' (Coray, al.). As the gen. ס̌aßónov in the next verse is clearly subjecti, interpr. (a) is certainly very plausible. Still as there is no satisfactory instance of an approach to that meaning in the

##  

The deacons must also be similarly irreproachable. and of good report ; the deaconesses too must be faith-

 ful.
N. T.- as кріิ $\mu$ seems naturally to point to Gorl (Rom. ii. 2), as it is elsewhere found only with a gen. objecti (Rom. iii. 8 , Rev. xvii. 1 ; xviii. 20 is a peculiar use), - and as the position of tov $\delta \iota a \beta$. docs not seem here to imply so close a union between the substantives as in ver. 7, we decide, with Chrys. and nearly all the ancient interpreters, in favor of (b), or the genitive objecti. Matthies urges against this the excess of lapse which would thus be implied ; the force of the allusion must, however, be looked for, not in the extent of the fall, but in the similarity of the circumstances: the devil was once a ministering spirit of Gook, but by insensate pride fell from his hierarchy; comp. Jude 6, and Suicer, Thesáur. s. v. סıáßo入os, Vol. I. p. 851. On the meaning and use of $\delta$ óá $\beta$. see notes on Eph. iv. 27 ; the translation 'calumniatoris' (Grinf., al.) is not consistent with its use in the $\mathrm{N} . \mathrm{T}$.
7. $\delta$ єे кai] 'But, instead of being a $\nu \in$ óфvтos, one of whose behavior in his new faith little can be known, he must also have a good testimony (not only from those within the Church, but) from those without.'
$\dot{\alpha} \pi 0 \tau \bar{\omega} \nu \quad \tilde{\xi} \xi \omega \vartheta \in \nu]$ 'from those without; ' the prep. certainly not implying 'among' (Conyb.), but correctly marking the source from which the testimony emanates : on the distinction between $\dot{\alpha} \pi \delta$ and $\pi$ apá, esp. with verbs of ' receiving,' see Winer, Gr. § 47. a, p. 331, note.
 v. 12, 13, Col. iv. 5, 1 Thess. iv. 12), like the Jewish שッมixan, is the regular designation for all not Christians, all those who were not oikeion $\tau \hat{\eta} s$ tívtews ; sce Kippke, Obs. Vol. II. p. 198, and the

Rabbinical citations in Schoettg. Hor. (on Cor. l. c.) Vol. r. p. 600.
$\dot{o} \nu \in \iota \delta \iota \sigma \mu o ̀ \nu$ к. т. $\lambda$ ] ' reproach, and (what is sure to follow) the snare of the devil, ' the absence of the article before $\pi a \gamma i \delta a$ being perhaps due to the preposition ; comp. Winer, Gr. § 19. 2. p. 114. The exact connection is somewhat doubtful as the gen. may depend (a) on both, or (b) only on the last of the two substantives. The omission of the preposition before $\pi a \gamma(\delta \alpha$ ( De W.) is an argument in favor of ( $a$ ); the isolated position, however, of $\dot{d}$ ets. and the connection of thought in ch. v. 14,15 , seem to preponderate in favor of (b), ojveiס. being thas absolute, and referring to 'the reproachful comments and judgment,' whether of those without (Chrys.) or within the Church. On the termination - $\sigma$ ) mos (action of the verb preceding from the subject) and its prevalence in later Greek, see Lobeck, Phryn. p. 511 ; comp. Donaldson Cratyl. § 253, p. 420. The expression $\pi a \gamma i s ~ \tau o \hat{v} \delta \iota a \beta$. occurs again 2 Tim. ii. 26 ; so similarly 1 Tim. vi. 9. It is here added to òveio., not epex-

 rather as marking the temptations that will be sure to follow the loss of character; 'quid spei restat ubi nullus est peccandi pudor ?' Calv.
8. $\delta \iota \alpha \kappa \delta \nu$ ous] 'deacons;' only used again by St. Paul in this special sense Phil. i. 1, and (fem.) Romans'xvi. 1, though appy. alluded to Rom. xii. 7, I Cor. xii. 28, and perhaps 1 Pet. iv. 11. The office of $\delta$ dáкovos ( $\delta$ tŋ̇k Butman Lexil. § 40 ), originally that of an almoner of the Church (Acts vi. 1 sq.), gradnally developed into that of an assistunt (àyrb-

## 

$\lambda \overline{4} \mathbf{e t s}, 1$ Cor. $l$. c.) and subordinate to the presbyters (Rothe, Anfänge, § 23, p. 166 sq.$)$ : their fundamental employment, however, still remained to them; hence the appropriateness of the caution, $\mu$ गे ai $\sigma \chi р о \kappa є р \delta є i ̄$, Neander, Planting, Vol. 1. p. 34 sq. (Buhn). On the duties of the office, see esp. Bingham, Antiq. Book Ir. 20.1 sq., Suicer, Thesaur. s. v. Vol. I. p. 869 sq., and Thomassin, Discipl. Eccl. Part 1. 2. 29 sq.
$\dot{\omega} \sigma \alpha \dot{v} \tau \omega s$ 'in like munner,' as the foregoing class included in the $\tau \delta \nu$ é $\pi$ íбкотоу, ver. 2 : it was not to be és é $\tau \in \rho \rho \omega$ (Arist. Elench. Soph. 7) in any of the necessary qualifications for the office of a deacon, but $\dot{\omega} \sigma u u^{T} \omega \mathrm{~s}$ as in the case of the bishops. It need scarcely to be added that the $\delta \in \hat{\imath}$ fival of the preceding verses must be supplied in the present member.
\$ıло́ ov s] 'double-longued,' Auth. Ver. 'speaking doubly,' Syr.: व̈тaछे $\lambda \in \gamma \delta \mu$.; mentioned in Poll. Onomast. II. 118. The meaning is rightly given by Theo-
 $\lambda$ '́үoytes. Grinfield (Schol. Hell.) compares $\delta i \not \gamma \lambda \omega \sigma \sigma o s$, Prov. xi. 13, Barnab. Epist. 19 : add $\delta \iota \chi$ о́ $\mu \nu$ àos Eurip. Orest. 890.
$\pi \rho \circ \sigma$ є́ $\chi$ ०עtas] 'giving (themselves) up to;' $\pi \rho \circ \sigma$ モ́ $\chi \in เ \nu$ thus used is more commonly found with abstract nouns, e. g. à $\nu a \gamma \nu \omega ́ \sigma \epsilon \ell$, ch. iv. 13, סıканобv́yq, Job xxvii. 6. Here, however, oìvos to入ùs (and so probably ง̀vat-
 Plut. Thess. 17) approaches somewhat to the nature of an abstract noun. This verb is only used by St. Paul in the Pastoral Epp.; comp., however, Acts xx. 28.
ai $\sigma \chi \rho$ ок $\in \rho \delta \in i s]$ 'greedy of base gains;' only here. and Tit. i. 7. The adverb occurs 1 Pet. v. 2. As in all these cases the term is in connection with an office in the Church, it seems most natural (with Huther) to refer it, not to gains from unclean (com-
pare Syr.) or disgraceful actions (Theodor.), but to dishonesty with the alins of the Church, or any abuse of their spiritual office for purposes of gain ; compare Tit. i. 11.
9. Exovras] 'having,' or (in the common ethical sense, Crabb, Synon. p. 252, ed. 1826) 'holding,' Auth. Version, 'behaltend,' De Wette: not for катéखoyras, Grot., a meaning more strong than the context requires and the use of the simple form will justify ; see notes on ch. i. 19. The emphasis falls on $\begin{gathered}\mathrm{E} \nu \mathrm{k} \text { кas. }\end{gathered}$ $\sigma \nu \nu \epsilon \in \delta .$, not on the participle.
$\tau \delta \mu \nu \sigma \tau, \tau \hat{\eta} s \pi i \sigma \tau \in \omega s]$ 'the mysstery of the fuith.' Owing to the different shades of meaning which $\mu v \sigma \tau$ भ́piov bears, the genitive in connection with it does not always admit the same explanation ; see notes on Eph. i. 9, iii. 4, vi. 19. Here $\pi i \sigma \tau \epsilon \omega s$ is apparently a pure possessive gen. ; it was not merely that about which the $\mu \nu \sigma \tau$. turned (gen. objecti, Eph. i. 9), nor the sulject of it (gen. of content ; this would tend to give ríotis an objective meaning, comp. exx. in Bernhardy, Synt. 111. 44, p. 161), nor exactly the substance of the $\mu \nu \sigma \tau$. (genitive materice, Eph. iii. 4), but rather that to which the $\mu v \sigma \tau$ भुpoov appertained : the truth, hitherto not comprehensible, but now revealed to man, was the property, object, of faith, that on which faith exercised itself. So very similarly ver. $16, \tau \delta \mu \nu \sigma \tau$. $\tau \hat{\eta} s$ $\epsilon \dot{v} \sigma \in \beta \epsilon$ 'ias, 'the mystery which belonged to, was the object contemplated by, godliness ; the hidden truth which was the basis of all practical piety; see Tittmann, Synon. r. p. 147, and Reuss, Theol. iv. 9, Vol. Ir. p. 89. חtotes is faith considered subjectively; not objective faith ('doctrina fidei'), a very doubtful meaning in the N. T. : see notes on Gal. i. 24. On the meaning of $\mu v \sigma \tau \eta$ pplov, see Sanderson, Serm. 9 (ad Aul.), Vol. I. p. 227 (Jacobs.), and the notes on Eph. v. 32.


èv $\kappa \propto \mathfrak{N} \alpha \rho \bar{a} \sigma \nu \nu \in เ \delta$.] Emphatic; defining the 'ratio habendi,' and in close connection with the part.: the rainupa $\sigma v \nu \in \lesssim \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \iota$ was to be, as it were, the ensphering principle, sce $2 \mathrm{Tim} . \mathrm{i} .13$. On $\sigma u \nu \in i \delta$. see notes on ch. i. 5.
10. Kal oîtoı $\delta \epsilon \in]$ And these also,' 'and these moreover,' ; comp. 2 Tim. iii.
 These words (appy, not recurly understood by Huther) admit only of one exflanation. In the formula кal- $\delta$ ' , like the Latin 'et-vero,' or the 'et-autem' of Plautus (see Hand, Tursell. Vol. 1. p. 588), while each particle retains its proper force, both together often have ' notionis quandam consociationem:' see Kílotz, Dezar. Vol. ir. p. 645. Thus while ка. connects or enhances, and $\delta$ è contrasts, the union of the two frequently causes $\delta \bar{e}$ to revert from its more marked, to its primary and less marked oppositive fores, 'in the second place' (comp. Donalds. Cratyl. § 155), so that the whole formula has more of an adjunctive character, and only retains enough of a retrospective opposition to define more sharply, expand, or strengthen, the tenor of the preceding words. Speaking roughly we might say, ' $\kappa a l$ conjungit, $\delta$ è intendit;' the true rationale, however, of the construction is best seen when $\mu \hat{\epsilon} \nu$ is found in the preceding clause, e.g. Xenophon Cyrop. vir. 1. 30, compare Acts iii. 22, 24. The formula then may be translated with sufficient accuracy, ' and-also,' ' and - 100 ,' the translation slightly varying according as the copulative or ascensive force of kal is most predominant. In Momer ral $\delta$ è is found united, in subsequent writers one or more words are interpolated ; sce Hartung, Partik. $\delta$ é, 5. 2, 3, Vol. 1. p. 181 sq., Lücke on 1 John i. 3, and comp. Matth. Gr. § 616. St. Paul's use of it is not confined to these

Epp. (Huther), for see Rom. xi. 23. It is used indeed by every writer in the N . T. except St. Jumes and St. Jude, principally by St. Luke and St. John, the latter of whom always uses it with cmphasis; in several instances, however (e.g. Luke x. 8, John vi. 5l), owing probably to ignorance of its true meaning, MSS. of some authority omit $\delta \epsilon^{\prime}$.
 not, formally, by Timothy or the elderhood (De W. compares Constit. Apost. virr. 4), but generally by the community at large among which they were to minister. The qualifications were principally of a character that could be recognized without any formal investigation.
 ' eing unaccused,' 'having no charge laid against them,' i. e. provided they are foumd so: conditional use of the participle (Donalds. Gr. §505) specifying the limitations and conditions under which they were to undertake the duties of the office; comp. Schmalfeld, Synt. §207. 5. On the distinction between à $\nu$ '́ $\gamma \kappa \lambda \eta \tau$ os ('qui non accusatus est' (and à $\nu \in \pi i \lambda \lambda \eta \mu \pi \tau o s$ (' in quo nulla justa causa sit reprehensionis'), sce Tittm. Synon. 1. p. 31, and comp. Tit. i. 6.
11. $\gamma v \nu a \hat{\kappa} \kappa \alpha s$ $\dot{\omega} \sigma a u ́ \tau \omega s$ ] 'women in like manner when engaged in the satme office.' It is somewhat difficult to decide whether, with the Greek commentators, we are here to understand by juvaikas (a) wives of the deacons, Auth Ver, Coray, Huth., and as dependant in structure on éxovtas, Bengel ; or (b) denconesses proper, quvaîes being used rather than ס́áкovor (fen.), Rom. xvi. 1. to sprevent confusion with masc. The other possible interpr. 'wives of deacons and 'ँ $\pi i \sigma \kappa$.' (Beza, Wieseler, Chronol. p. 309) does not suit the context, which turns only on ठtáкovot; obs. ver. 12. Huther




defends（a）on the ground that in one part of the deacon＇s office（care of sick and destitute）their wives might be fit－ tingly associated with them．This is plausible；when，however，we observe the difference of class to which $\dot{\omega} \sigma a v i t \omega s$ seems to point（ver．8，ch．ii．9，Tit．ii． 3,6 ），－the omission of aù $\omega \nu$ ，－the or－ der and parallelism of qualifications in ver． 8 and 11，coupled with the suitable change of $\delta \iota \lambda \delta$ yous to $\delta i \alpha \beta \dot{\delta} \lambda o u s$ ，and the substitution of $\pi เ \sigma \tau \alpha{ }^{\prime} s$ e่ $\nu \pi \alpha \hat{\alpha} เ \nu$ for the more specific air $\chi \rho \circ$ ．（deaconesses were probably almoners，Coteler，Const．Apost． III．15，but in a much less degree），－ the absence of any notice of the wives of èmíкoтot，－and lastly the omission of any special notice of domestic duties， though it follows（ver．12）in the case of the men，we can scarcely avoid deciding， with Chrys．，most ancient and several modern expositors（Wies．，Alf．，W ordsw．， al．），that（b）＇diaconissce＇are here allud－ ed to．On the duties of the office，see Bingham，Antiq．11．22， 8 sq．，Suicer， Thesaur．s．v．Vol．1．p．864，Herzog， Real－Encycl．s．v．Vol．iri．p．368，and the special treatise of Ziegler，de Diacon． et Diaconiss．Witeb． 1678.
$\delta \iota a \beta \delta \lambda 0 v s$ ］＇slanderous，＇＇traducers，＇ катала́入ous，Theophyl．；only in the Pas－ toral Epp．：twice in reference to women， here and in Tit．ii． 3 ；once in ref．to men， 2 Tim．iii．3．See the good article on the word in Suicer，Thesaur．Vol．I． p． 848 sq ．
$\nu \eta \phi \dot{\alpha} \lambda$ tovs $\kappa . \tau \cdot \lambda$.$] ＇sober，faithful in all．things．＇$ The evident parallelism between the qualifications in ver． 8 ，and the present， seem to imply that $\nu \eta \phi$ á $\lambda$ tos has its literal meaning；see notes on ver．2．The last qualification，$\pi เ \sigma \tau \grave{\alpha} s$ ढ่ $\nu \pi \hat{\alpha} \sigma \iota \nu$ ，is stated
very generally；it does not，of course， preclude a ref．to domestic calls and cares （see Huther），but it certainly seems far more applicable to ecelesiastical duties．

12．$\delta \iota \alpha$ коขо к к．т．$\lambda_{\text {．}}$ ］Exactly the same qualifications in respect of their domestic relations required in the $\delta$ \＆$\alpha-$ ко⿱亠䒑日，as in the émíккотоs：sec notes on ver． 4.

13．$\gamma$ d́p］The importance of the of－ fice is a sufficient warrant for the reason－ ableness of the preceding recquisitions．
$\beta a 刃 \mu \delta \nu \kappa \alpha \lambda \delta \nu]$＇u good dergree，＇Auth．
 T．（not an Ionic form of $\beta a \sigma \mu \delta^{\prime}$ ，Mack， but the very reverse ：comp．àpıı $\mu \dot{\delta} s$, à $p \vartheta-$ $\mu$ ós，and Donalds．Caatyl．§ 253），has received three different explanations；ci－ ther（a）＇an（ecclesiastical）step，＇in refer－ ence to an advance to a higher spiritual office ※th．，Jerome，and appy．Chrys．， al．；（b）＇a post，＇in reference to the hon－ orable position a deacon occupied in the Church，Matth．，Huther ；（c）＇a degree，＇． in reference to the judgment of God，and to their reward $\epsilon^{\prime} \nu \tau \bar{\varphi} \mu^{\prime} \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \lambda$ дovтı $\beta \dot{\prime} \dot{\prime} \omega$ ，The－ od．，De Wette，al．Of these（a）appears， on exegetical grounds，clearly untenable （opp．to Wordsworth）；for surely such a ground of encouragement as ecclesias． tical promotion（were this even histori－ cally demonstrable，which appears not the case in the first two centuries）scems strangely out of place in St．Paul＇s mouth，and preserves no harmony with the subsequent words．Against（b）the aor．$\delta$ takov．is not fairly conclusive，as it may admit a reference not necessarily to a remote，but to an immediate past ；the $\pi \varepsilon \rho \iota \pi o i n \sigma t s$ of a good position would nat－ urally ensue after some discharge of tho סıakovía．The associated clause，how－

1 write this to guard thy conduct in the church of the living God; verily great is the mystery of godliness.


ever, and the use of the term $\pi \alpha \rho \rho \bar{\eta} \sigma^{\prime} \alpha$, especially with its modal adjunct $\frac{e}{\nu} \pi i \sigma-$ $\tau \in \iota$ к. $\tau . \lambda$., both seem so little in harmony with this ecclesiastical reference, while on the other hand they point so very naturally to the position of the Christian with respect to God (see notes on Eph. iii. 12, and comp. Heb. iv. 16, 1 John ii. 28 , iii. 21), and derive so very plausible support from the appy. parallel passage, ch. vi. 19, that we decide somewhat unhesitatingly in favor of (c), and refer Basjuds to the step or degree which a faithful discharge of the סıaкovía would acquire in the eyes of God.
$\pi \in \rho \iota \pi 0$ ८o $\nu \nu \tau \alpha \iota \in \alpha \cup \tau 0 \hat{\iota} s]^{\prime}$ 'acquire, obtain for themselves,' - only here and Acts xx. 28 (a speech of St. Paul's); compare also 1 Thess. $\nabla .9, \pi \epsilon \rho \iota \pi o i \eta \sigma \iota \nu$ $\sigma \omega \tau \eta \rho i \alpha a s$, which seems indirectly to yield considerable support to the foregoing interpretation of $\beta$ asjuóv. For examples of the reflexive pronoun with middle verbs, see Winer, Gr. § 38.6, p. 230. The insertion here perhaps makes the personal reference a little more certain and definite: the duties of the deacon had commonly reference to others.
$\pi \alpha \dot{\rho} \oint \eta \sigma[\alpha \nu] \quad$ 'boldness,' 'fiduciam,' Clarom., Vulg.; properly 'openness' of (Mark viii. 32, al., and frequently in St. Johnj or 'boldness of speech' (Acts iv. 13), and thence derivatively that 'confidence and boldness of spirit' (ǎסє $\frac{1}{}$, Suidas), with which the believer is permitted and encouraged (Heb. iv. 16) to approach his heavenly Father; 1 John ii. 28 , iii. 21 , etc. The use of $\pi \alpha \rho p$. in reference to the final reward, is clearly evinced in 1 John iv, 17. Huther urges that this derivative meaning always arises from, and is marked by, its concomitants, $\pi \rho \partial_{s} \tau \delta \nu \Theta \epsilon o ́ \nu, 1$ John iii. 21, etc. Here $\epsilon_{\epsilon} \nu \boldsymbol{\nu} \pi \boldsymbol{i} \sigma \tau \epsilon \iota \kappa$ к. $\boldsymbol{\tau}, \lambda$. does seem such an adjunct ; at any rate, 2 Cor. vii.

4 (adduced by Huther), where there is no similar addition, cannot plausibly be compared with the present case : see De Wette in loc., whose note on this passage is full and explicit.
'่ $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ í $\sigma \tau \in t$ к. $\tau . \lambda_{\text {.] }}$ ' in fuith which is in Christ J.' By the insertion of the article (comp. ch. i. 14, 2 Tim. i. 13, iii. 15 , al.), two moments of thought are expressed, the latter of which explains and enhances the former: 'in fide (riorts was the foundation, substratum, of the $\left.\pi a p{ }_{\rho}.\right)$, eâque in Chr. Jes. collocatâ ;' sec Fritz. Rom. iii. 25, Vol. 1. p. 195. The article is not uncommonly omitted (Gal. iii. 26, Eph. i. 15, Col. i. 4) on the principle explained in notes on $E p h$. i. 15. On the meaning of $\pi เ \sigma \tau$. $\ell \nu$, comp. notes on ch. i. 16.
14. $\tau \alpha \hat{v} \tau, \alpha]$ 'These things;' not 'totam epistolam,' Beng., but more probably 'these foregoing brief directions,' Hamm. If St. Paul had here adopted the epistolary aorist (comp. notes on Gal. vi. 11), the latter reference would have been nearly certain. The use of the present leaves it more doubtful, and remands us to the context ; this (compare ver. 15) certainly seems to limit $\tau \alpha \hat{v} \tau \alpha$ to 'superiora illa de Episcoporum, Diaconorumque officiis,' Goth. ap. Pol. Syn. On the uses of $\gamma$ páф $\omega$ and ${ }^{\text {érpaqua }}$ see Winer, Gr. § 40. 5, p. 249.
दं $\lambda \pi\{\zeta \omega \nu]$ ' hoping,' or, more definitely, 'though I hope,' the part. having its concessive force; see Donalds. Gr. § 621. The actual reason of his writing is inplied in the following verse, iva eioņs к. $\tau . \lambda$. $\tau \alpha ́ \chi \iota o \nu]$ ' mure quickly;'? not, on the one hand, ' compar. absoluti loco positum' (Beza ; тáxı $\sigma \tau \alpha$, Coray), nor, on the other, with marked compar. force, 'sooner than thou wilt need these instructions' (Winer, Gr. § 35.4, p. 217), but probably with a more

##  

suppressed comp. reference, 'sooner than these instructions presuppose,' 'sooner than I anticipate.' Such comparatives often refer to the suppressed feelings of the subject ; comp. Theano, ad Eubul. p. 86 (ed. Gale), $\pi a \iota \delta i ́ o \nu, ~ 九 ̀ \nu \nu ~ \mu \grave{~} \tau \alpha \alpha^{2} เ o \nu ~ \phi a ́ \gamma \eta$, $\kappa \lambda \alpha \in \epsilon$. The reading $\epsilon^{\epsilon} \nu \tau \alpha ́ \chi \in b$ (Lach., with $\mathrm{ACD}^{\prime}$ ) seems only an explanatory gloss.
15. B $\rho \alpha \delta$ ú $\nu \omega]$ 'should tarry;' only here and 2 P'et. iii. 9. Wieseler (Chronol. p. 315) refers this to the possibility of the apostle's journey, perhaps to Crete (p. 347), or to some place he had not included in his original plan. This rests on the supposition that the Epistle was written in the period included in the Acts,-which, however (see notes on ch. i. 3), does not seem probable.
 being anarthrous either owing to the prep. (Winer, Gr. § 19. 2) or the anarthrous gen. which follows ; comp. Middleton, Grr. Art. III. 3. 6. This appellation, derived from the Old Test., where it denotes primarily the temple (2 Chron. v. 14, Ezra v. 16. al., comp. Matth. xxi. 13) and secondurily the covenant-people (Numbers xii. 7, Hosea viii. 1), those among whom God specially dwelt, is suitably applied in the N . Test. to the Church,- either viewed as the spiritual building which rests on Christ as the corner-stone (Eph. ii. 20), or as the truc temple in which Christ is the true High Priest (Heb. iii. 6, 1 Pet. iv. 17) ; sce Ebrard, Dogmatik, § 468, Vol. II. p. 39.. $\dot{\sim} \nu a \sigma \tau \rho \in ́ \phi \in \sigma \hat{\sim} a l]$ 'walk, have (thy) conversation in.' It is doubtful whether this verb is to he taken (a) absolutely, 'how men ought to walk;' Pcile, Huther, al. ; or (b) specially with reference to Timothy, 'how thou oughtest to walk,' Auth. Ver., De Wette, al. Huther urges against (b) that in what precedes Timothy has no active course
assigned to hiim, but rather the supervision of it in others ; as, however àvactpéq. is a 'vox media' which does not mark mere activities, but rather conduct and deportment in its most inclusive reference (comp. Eph. ii. 3, where it closely follows the Hebraistic $\pi \epsilon \rho เ \pi a \tau \in i v$, )-as the explicative clause $\mathfrak{\eta} \tau \iota \varsigma$ é $\sigma \tau i \nu \kappa$ к. т. $\lambda$. seeıns intended to impress on Timothy the greatness of his oikovouía, - and as the expansion of oîk. $\Theta \in o \hat{v}$ from the special church over which Timothy presided, to the general idea of the universal Church, involves no real difficulty (see De W.), it seems best to adopt $(b)$ and limit d̀va $\sigma \tau \rho$. to Timothy: so rightly Clarom., Vulg. ท̈ t เs] which indeed; explanatory use of the indef. relative: compare notes on Eph. i. 23, and esp. Gal. iv. 24, where the uses of ö $\sigma$ tts are explained at length. $\quad \underset{\epsilon \kappa \kappa \eta \sigma i \alpha a}{ }$ $\Theta \in o \hat{v}$ 乌 $\omega \nu \tau o s]$ ' the Church of the living God ;' fuller definition of the oikos $\Theta \epsilon o \hat{v}$, on the side of its internal and spiritucal glory: it was no material fane ('opponitur fano Dianæ,' Beng.) of false clead deities, but a living and spiritual comnunity, a life stream (see Olsh. on Matth. xvi. 18), of believers in an ever-living God. 'Eкк $\lambda \eta \sigma$ ía appears to have two meanings, according to the context and point of view in which it is regarded. On the one hand, in accordance with its simple etymological sense (Acts xix. 39), it denotes a Christian congregation ( $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \iota \sigma \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \delta \nu \sigma \dot{\prime} \lambda \lambda o \gamma o \nu$, TheodosiusMops ), with a local reference of greater or less amplitude; see exx. in Pearson, Creed, Art. Ix. Vol. 1. p. 397 (ed. Burton) : on the other, it involves the meaning and adaptations of $3 \prod_{T} p_{T}$ in the O . T., and denotes the New-Covenant people of God, with spiritual referenco to their sacramental union in Clirist and communion with one another ; see esp. Bp.

## 16 <br> 

16. ös] So Tisch., Lachm., Tregelles, A/f., Wordsw., and apparently the majority of modern critics. ©eds (Rec.) is adupted by Mill, Matth., Scholz, some commentr., Leo, Mack, Burton, P'cile, al., and, it ought nut to be suppressed, some of our hest Euglish divines, Bull, Waterland (Vol.II. p. 158). The state of evidence is briefly as follows. (1) "Os is read with $\mathrm{A}^{\prime}$ [indisputubly: after minute personal inspection ; see note, p. 103] C ${ }^{\text {L }}$ [Tisch. Prol. Cod. Ephr. § 7, p. 39] FG and the newlydiscovered ※゙ [Tisch. Notitia Cod. Sinait. p. 20]; 17.73.81; Syr.-Phil., Copt., Sah., Goth. ; also (òs or ó) Syr. Ar. (Erp.), Eth., Arm. ; Cyr., Theod.-Mops, Epiph., Gelas., Hieron. in Esaium Lili. $11 . \quad$ (2) 8 with $D^{1}$; Clarom., Vulg.; nearly all Latin Ff. (3) $\mathcal{A} \in \dot{6} s$, with $\mathrm{D}^{3} \mathrm{KL}$; nearly all mss.; Arab. (Polygl.), Slav.; Did., Chrys. (? sce Tregelles, p. 227 note), Theod., Euthal.,

Taylor, Dissuasive, Part 1r. 1. 1, Ebrard, Dogmatik, § 467, Vol. 11. p. 392, and the various usages cited by Suicer, Thestuur. s. v. Vol. 1. p. 1049.
$\sigma \tau \hat{u} \lambda \operatorname{os} k a l$ € $\delta \rho$. .] 'pillar' and basis of the truth:' no $\hat{\epsilon} \nu$ סià $\delta$ ouiv ( $=$ 'firmlygrounded,' Beng., Peile), but a climactic apposition to $\dot{\epsilon}^{\kappa} \kappa \kappa \lambda$. $\Theta \in о \hat{u} \zeta \hat{\omega} \nu \tau o s,-$ defining, with indirect allusion to nascent and developing heresies (see chap. iv. 1 sq.), the true note, office, and vocation of the


 there no Church, there would be no witness, no guardian of archives, no basis, nothing whereon acknowledged truth could rest. Chrysostom adopts the right connection, but inverts the statement, $\dot{\eta}$
 éjp., missing appy, the obvious distinction between truth in the abstract, and truth, the saving truth of the Gospel, as reveuled to, and acknowledged by, men; comp. Taylor, Dissuasive, Part II. 1. 1. 3. Such appears the only natural construction of the clause. A close connection with what follows, as has been advocated by Episcopius (Inst. Theol. Iv. 1. 8, Vol. I. p. 241) and others (it is to be feared mainly from polemical reasons), is alike abrupt (there being no connecting particles), illogical (a strong substantival, being united with a weak adjecti-
val predication), and hopelessly artificial : see De Wette in loc. It may be added that $\sigma \tau \hat{v} \lambda o s$ and $£ \delta \rho a i \omega \mu \alpha\left\{\begin{array}{c}\alpha \\ \pi\end{array} \xi\right.$
 do not appy. involve any architectural allusion to heathen temples, etc. (Deyling, Obs. Art. 66, Vol. I. p. 317), but are only simple metaphorical expressions of the stability and permanence of the support: sec the copious illustrations of this passage in Suicer, Thesaur. Vol. Ir. pp. 1042-1066.
16. каl $\delta \mu$ o $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ o $\gamma$ ov $\mu \in ́ \nu \omega s$ к. $\tau$. $\lambda$.] - And confessedly or indisputably great (i.e. deep, Ephesians v. 32) is the mystery, etc.
 'nemo (scil. of those to whom this $\mu v \sigma \tau$. is revealed), cui mica sanæ mentis inest de eâ re potest controversiam moverc,' Altmann, Melet. 10, Vol. 11. p. 268. The kal is not simply copulative, but heightens the force of the predication, 'yes, confessedly great,' etc.; compare Hartung, Partik. kaí, 5. 4, Vol. 1. p. 145. Several examples of a similar use of $\dot{\delta} \mu 0 \lambda$. are cited by Wetstcin and Raphel in loc. ; add Joseph. Ant. 1. 10. 2, गु̀ ס $\delta \frac{1}{t}$ тoloûtos $\delta \mu 0 \lambda 0 \gamma$, ib. II. 9. 6, $\delta \mu 0 \lambda$ об. ${ }^{\text {'EBpailw }}$ ápıotos ; sce also Suicer, Thesaur. Vol. ii. p. 479, and Altmann, loc. cit, where there is a discussion of some merit on the whole verse.
$\epsilon \dot{u} \sigma \in \beta \in i ́ a s \mu \cup \sigma \tau \dot{\eta} \rho\llcorner\circ \nu]$ ' the mystery

## 

Damasc., Theophyl., ©cum.,- Ignat. Eph. 19 (but very doulbtful). On reviewing this evidence, as not only the most important uncial MSS., bitt all the Vv. ofder than the 7 the century are distinetly in favor of a a relutice, -as os seems only a Latiniziug variation of ös,-and lastly, as os is the more difticult, though really the more intelligible, reading (Hlufmam, Schrifitb. Vol. 1. p. 143), and on every reasou more likely to have heen changed into $\Theta$ eds (Macedonius is actually said to have been expelled for making the ehange, Liber 1 iac. Brex. cap. 19) than vice versấ, we unhesitatingly decide in favor of \&s. For further iuformation on this subject, sce Griesbach, Symb. Crit. Vol. r. pp. 8-54, Tregelles, Printed Text of N. T. p. 227, Davidson, Bibl. Criticism, ch. 66, p. 828.
of yodliness ;' 'ipsa doctrina ad quam omnis pietas sive religio Christiana referenda est,' Tittmann, Synon. 1. p. 147: see notes on ver. 9 , where the gen. is investigated.
 к. т. त.] 'Who was manifested in the flesh.' The construction camot be either satisfactorily or grammatieally explained unless we agree to abide by the plain and proper meaning of the relative. Thus, then, os is not emphatic, ' He who' (Tregelles, Pr. Text, p. 278), nor 'including in itself both the demonstrative and relative' (Davidson, Bibl. Crit. p. 846, - a very doubtful assertion ; compare Day, on the Relatire, \$ 1. p. 8 ; \$ 60 , 61. p. 98),-nor absolute, 'cece! est qui.' (Matthies: John i. 46, iii. 34, Rom. ii. 23,1 Cor. vii. 37,1 John i. 3 , are irrelevant, being only exx. of an ellipsis of the demonstr.), - nor, by a ' constructio ad sensum,' the relative to $\mu v \sigma \tau$ 亿ppoo, Olsh. (Col. i. 26,27 is no parallicl, being only a common case of attraction, Winer, Gr. § $24.3, \mathrm{p} .150$ ), -but is a relative to an omitted though easily recognized antecedent, viz., Christ; so De Wette, and apparently Alf. (whose note, however, is not perfectly perspicuous). To refer it to the preceding Өєoй (Wordsworth) seems very forced, especially after the intervention of the emplatic words atềoos $\kappa . \tau \lambda$. It may be remarked that the rhythmical as well as antithetical character of the clauses (see the not im-
probable arrangement in Mack, and comp. notes to Trunsl.) and the known existence of such compositions (Eph r. 19; compare Bull, Fid. Nic. 11. 3. 1) render it not by any means improbable that the words are quoted from some well known hymn, or possibly from some familiar confession of faith; compare Winer, Gr. $\$ 64.3$, p. 519 , and see Rambath, Anthologie, Vol. I. p. 33, where E.ph. v. 14 is also ascribed to the same snurce ; so also Huth. and Wiesinger. ̇ $\phi \alpha \nu \in \rho \omega \mathfrak{\omega} \eta$ ] 'uas manifested ;' comp.

 as Huther well suggests, there is a powcrful argument for the pre-existence of Christ.
 tified (was shown to be, evinced to be, just, Matth. xi. 19, Luke vii. 35) in spirit (in the higher sphere of His divine life).' There is some little difficulty in these words, especially in $\pi \nu \epsilon^{\mu} \mu a \tau \iota$. The meaning however scems fixed by the antithesis $\sigma \alpha \rho k i$, especially when compared with other passages in which the higher and lower sides of that nature which our Lord was pleased to assume are similerly put in contrast. The $\pi \nu \in \hat{i}-$ $\mu \mathrm{c}$ of Christ is not here the Holy Spirit (comp. Pearson, Creed, Vol. 1. p. 163), nor $\grave{\eta}$ जैía ס̀́vauts, Coray (comp. Chrys., and sec Suicer, Thesaur. Vol. 1r. p. 777), but the higher principle of spiritual life

## 

(Schubert, Gesch. der Seele, §48, Vol. 1I. p. 498) which was, not itself the Divinity, Wiesing. (this would be an Apollinarian assertion), but especially and intimately united (not blended) and associated with it. In this higher spiritual nature, in all its manifestations, whether in His words and works, or in the events of His life, He was shown to be the Allholy, and the All-righteous, yea, 'manifested with power to be the Son of God,' Rom. i. 4, Jolın i. 14 ; compare 1 Pet. iii. 18 (Tisch., Lachm.), and Middleton, in loc. p. 430, but esp. the excellent note of Meyer on Rom. l. c. The assertion of some commentators that the term $\sigma$ àp $\xi$ includes the body, soul, and sprrit ' of Christ is not reconcilable with the principles of biblical psychology ; the $\sigma$ àp $\xi$ may perhaps sometimes include the $\psi v \chi \dot{\eta}$, but never, in such passages of obvious antithesis, the $\pi \nu \epsilon \hat{\nu} \mu \alpha$ as well; see Lüccke, on John i. 14.

The student of
St. Paul's Epp. cannot be too earnestly
recommended to acquire some rudiments of a most important but very neglected subject - biblical Psychology. Much information of a general kind will be found in Schubert, Gesch. der Seele (ed. 2), aud of a more specific nature in Beck, Bibl. Seelenlehre (a small but excellent treatise), Delitzsch, Bibl. Psychol., and Olshausen, Opuscula, Art. 6.
 Auth. Ver., i. e. 'appeared unto, showed Iiinself unto, angels'. Both the use of òфฟへ̂vaı (occurring more than twenty times in the N. T., and nearly always with reference to the self-exlibition of the subject), and the invariable meaning of ár $\gamma \boldsymbol{\text { ® }}$ ot in the N. 'T. (not 'apostles,' Leo, Pcile, al., but 'angels') preclude any other translation. The epoch, however, precisely referred to cannot be defined with certainty. The grouping of the
clanses (see notes to Transl.), according to which the first two in each division appear to point to earthly relations, the third to heavenly, seem to render it very probable that the general manifestation of Christ to angels through His incarna-tion,- not, inversely, the specific appearances of them during some scenes of His earthly life ('Theophyl., comp. Alf.), nor any (assumed) specific manifestation in heaven (De W.), - is here alluded to:

 $\Theta \in o \hat{v} \pi \rho o ́ \tau \epsilon \rho \circ \nu$ où $\chi$ óp̄̄עtes; so also The-

 $\epsilon^{\prime} \dot{\imath} \in \dot{\alpha} \sigma a \nu \tau o$. Hammond includes also evil angels; this is possible, but the antithesis of clauses seems opposed to it.
ह่ $\pi เ \sigma \tau \in \dot{v} \uparrow \uparrow \eta$ ] 'was believed on;' not 'fidem sibi fecit,' Raphel, but 'files illi habita est,' Beza; compare 2 Thess. i. 10, and see also Winer, Gram. § 39.1 , p. 233.
$\dot{\alpha} \nu \in \lambda \eta$ भ́ $\mu \phi$ जे $\eta$ '̇ $\nu$ ठó $\xi \eta$ ] 'was received up in glory;' ${ }^{\prime} \nu$ here being used, not simply for $\epsilon$ is (Rosenm.), nor with סóg $\eta$ as an equivalent of $\grave{e} \nu \delta \delta o ́ \xi \omega s$ (comp. Hammond), but in a sort of 'prognans sen-
 Huther) ; see Winer, Gr. §50. 4, p. 367 sq., and comp. Ellendt, Lex. Sophocl. Vol. I. p. 598. The event here referred to is simply and plainly the historical ascent of Christ into heaven. No words can be more distinct ; compare à $\nu \in \lambda \dot{\eta} \mu \phi$ Эท, Mark xvi. 19, Acts i. 2, 11 (part.), 22 ; and à $\nu \in \phi \epsilon ́ \rho \in \tau 0$ єis $\tau \delta \nu$ où $\rho \alpha \nu \delta \nu$, Luke xxiv. 51 (Lachm.)

For a good sermon on the whole verse see Sanderson, Serm. Ix. (ad Aul.), p. 479 sq . (Lond. 1689), and for devotional comments of the highest strain, Bp. Hall, Great Mystery of Godliness, Vol. viri. p. 330 (Oxford 1837).

In the latter times men shall fall away from the faith, and shall teach prineiples of abstinence which are not approved of God.
$\lambda i ́ a \iota s$ Saı $\mu$ оиí $\omega$,
 pots. кalpoîs ảmoбтท́боעтaí тives $\tau \eta$ ท $\pi i \sigma \tau \in \omega \varsigma$,


 the (Holy) Spirit; ' contrast to the foregoing in the present and in the future, the particle $\delta \bar{\epsilon}$ here indicating no transition to a new subject (Auth., Conyb.; comp. notes on Gal. iii 8), but retaining its usual antithetical force ; 'great indeed as is the mystery of godliness, the Holy Spirit has still declared that there shall be disbelief and apostasy ;' $\mu$ ो av$\mu \dot{d} \sigma \eta s$, Chrys. $\quad \dot{\eta} \eta \tau \bar{\omega} s]$ ' distinct ly,' 'expressly' ( $\phi a v \in \rho \bar{\omega} s, ~ \pi \alpha \phi \bar{\omega} s$, , $\mu$ одо-
 ' non obscure aut involute, ut fere loqui solent prophete,' Justiniani), not only in the prophecies of our Lord, Matth. xxiv. 11 , al., and the predictions, whether of the apostles (comp. 1 John ii. 18, 2 Pet. iii. 3, Jude 18) or of the prophets in the various Christian churches (Neander, Planting, Vol. 1. p. 340), but more particularly in the special revelations which the Holy Spirit made to St. Paul himself; comp. 2 Thess. ii. 3 sq.
$\dot{v} \sigma \tau$ द́pols kalpois] 'latter times.' This expression, used only in this place, is not perfectly synonymous (Reuss, Theol. Chrel. Vol. 11. p. 224) with è exádтats $\mathfrak{\eta} \mu$ '́pass, 2 Tim. iii. 1, 2 Pet. iii. 3 (Lachm., Tisch.), James v. 3 (compare
 Jude 18) ; the latter expression, as Hu ther correctly observes, points more specifically to the period immediately preceding the completion of the kingdom of Christ; the former only to a period future to the speaker,- oi àкó入ouશoı Xpóvol, Coray ; see Pearson, Minor Works, Vol. 11. p. 42. In the apostasy of the present, the inspired apostle secs the commencement of the fuller apostasy of the future. In this and a few other passages
in the N. T., kaupos appears nenrly synonymous with $\chi$ pobos ; comp. Lobeck, Ajax, p. 85.
$\pi \rho \circ \sigma \epsilon \in \chi \circ \nu \tau \epsilon s]$ See notes on ch. i. 4. $\pi \nu \in \dot{v} \mu$. $\pi \lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu$ ols) 'deceiving spirits;' certainly not merely the false teachers themselves (Mack, Coray, al.), - a needless violation of the primary meaning of $\pi \nu \in \hat{\nu} \mu a$, - but, as the antithesis $\tau \grave{\partial} \Pi \nu \in \hat{\nu} \mu \alpha$ suggests, the deceiving powers and principles, the spiritual emissaries of satan, which work in their hearts ; comp. Eplh. ii. 2 , vi. 12 (see notes), 1 John iv. 1 sq. $\delta, \delta \alpha \sigma \kappa$. $\delta a \iota \mu 0 \nu[\omega \nu]$ 'doctrines of devils;' not 'doctrines about devils,' Mede, al., 'demonolatry,' P'eile ( $\delta a u \mu$. being a gen. objecti), but doctrines emanating from, taught by, devils' (gen. suljecti) ; see Winer, Gr. § 30. 1. obs., p. 168, and comp. Thorndike, Cur. of Girace, in. 12, Vol. III. p. 195 (1.-C.L.). The term סaupóviov, it may be observed, is not here a 'vox media' (comp. Ign. Smyrn. 3), but has its usual N. T. meaning; see Pearson, Minor Works, Vol. ir. p. 46. Olshausen significantly remarks on this passage, that man never stands isolated; if he is not influenced by $\tau \delta$
 powers of $\tau \delta \partial \pi \nu \in \tilde{\nu} \mu a$. $\tau \hat{\jmath} s \pi \lambda \alpha{ }^{2} \eta s$ ( 1 Jolin iv. 6).
 ' in (through) the hypocrisy of the speakers of lies,' Hammond ; prepositional clause appended to $\pi \rho \rho \sigma$ ' $\chi$ OעT $\epsilon$, defining the manner (pretended sanctity and ortho-
 brought about and furthered; ìv being instrumental. Leo and Matth explain the clause as a second modal definition of the fallers away, parallel to $\pi \rho \sigma \sigma$ ' $\chi$ ovres к. $\tau . \lambda$, and more immediately de-

pendent on àтoбтท́боעтat；＇habent in se eam ঠ́то́кр．qualis est ช́токр．$\psi є и \delta о \lambda$ ．，＇ Heinr．，and so appy．Auth．Ver．This isdoubtful ；the third clause $\kappa \omega \lambda$ ．$\gamma \alpha \mu \epsilon i v$ seems far too direct an act of the false teachers suitably to find a place in such an indirect definition of the falsely taught． Matth．urges the absence of the article before $\dot{\text { úтокрi } \sigma \epsilon \text { ，，but this after the prep．}}$ （Huther ncedlessly pleads N．T．laxity） is perfectly intelligible（Winer，Gr．§ 19. 2，p．114），even if it be not referable to the principle of correlation ；comp．Mid－ dleton，Art iit．3．6．Thus，then，lying teachers will be the mediate，evil spirits the immediate，causes of the apostasy．
$\kappa \in \kappa \alpha v \tau$ ．$\tau$ ì $\nu$ i $\delta i(\alpha \nu \quad \sigma v \nu \in i \delta$ ．］＇being tranded on their own conscience：＇the ac－ cusative with the passive verb（compare ch．vi． $5, \delta \iota € \emptyset \uparrow \alpha \rho \mu \epsilon ́ \nu 0 九 \tau \partial ̀ \nu \nu o u ̂ \nu$ ，etc．）cor－ rectly specifies the place in which the ac－ tion of the verb is principally manifested． The exact application of the metaphor is doubtiul ；it may be referred to the $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \sigma$－ $\chi \alpha ́ \tau \eta$ à $\nu \alpha \lambda \gamma \eta \sigma i \alpha$ after cautery（Theodo－ ret），or more probably to the penal brand which their depraved conscience bore， as it were，on its brow（Theophyl．）； ＇insignitæ nequitiæ viros et quasi scele－ rum mancipia，＇Justiniani．See the nu－ merous and fairly pertinent examples cited by Elsner，Obs．Vol．iI．p．＇298， Kiypke，Obs．Vol．11．p．357．＇Iסía is not without emphasis ；they knew the brand they bore，and yet with a show of outward sanctity（comp．íтокрí $\sigma \iota$ ）they strove to beguile and to seduce others， and make them as bad as themselves．

3．$\kappa \omega \lambda \nu \delta \nu \tau \omega \nu \quad \gamma \alpha \mu \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu]$＇forbid－ ding to marry．＇This characteristic，which eame afterwards into such special prom－ inence in the more developed Gnosticism （see Clem．Alex．Strom．in．6，Irenæus， Herr．1．22；al．），first showed itself in the fulse asceticism of the Essenes（see esp．

Joseph．Bell．Jud．ir．8．2，үáuou $\mu$ èv نiтepoчía $\pi \alpha \rho^{\prime}$ aîroîs，Antiq．xvilı．1．5．
 17）and Therapeutæ，and was one of those nascent errors which the inspired apastle foresaw would grow into the im－ pious dogma of later times，＇nubere et grenerare a Satanâ dicunt esse，＇Irenæus， l．c．：see Suicer，Thesaur．Vol．I．p． 735. $\dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon ́ \chi \in \sigma \mathfrak{N} \alpha \iota \beta \rho \omega \mu \alpha \dot{\alpha} \tau \nu]$＇（bidding） to abstain from meats；＇к由入vóvt $\omega \nu$ must be resolved into $\pi a p a \gamma \gamma \in \lambda \lambda o ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu \quad \mu \dot{\eta}$（see （h．ii．12），from which $\pi a p a \gamma \gamma$ ．must be carried on to the second clause ；sec Wi－ ner，Gr．§66．2，p．548．Distinct no－ tices of this abstinence and severity in respect of food are to be found in the ac－ count of the Therapeutæ in Philo，Vit． Contempl．§4，Vol．ir．p． 477 （ed．Mang．）． When there are thus such clear traces of a morbid and perverted asceticism in the apostle＇s own day，it is idle in Baur to urge these notices as evidences against the authenticity of the Epistle．It may be remarked that the view taken of the èrrors combated in this and the other Pastoral Epp．（see notes on ch．i．3）ap－ pears to be confirmed by the present pas－ sage．St．Paul is alluding throughout， not to Judaism proper，but to that false spiritualism and those perverted ascetical tendencies，which emanating from Juda－ ism，and gradually mingling with simi－ lar principles derived from other systems （compare Col．ii． 8 sq．，and see Reuss， Theol．Chret．Vol．11．p．645，646），at last，after the apostolic age，became merged in a fuller and wider Gnosticism ； see also Wiesinger in loc．，whose indirect confutation of Baur is satisfactory and convincing．On asceticism generally， and the view taken of it in the N．T．， comp．Rothe，Theol．Ethik，§ 878 sq．， Vol．III．p． 120 sq．
\＆$\delta \quad \Theta \in \delta$ s к：т．$\lambda_{i}$ ］＇＇which God created

## 

to le partaken of,' etc.: confutation of the second error. The reason why the former error is left unnoticed has been differently explained. The most probable solution is that the prohibition of marriage had not as yet assumed so definite a form as the interdiction of certain kinds of food. The Essenes themselves were divided on this very point ; see Joseph. Bell. Jud. 11. 8. 13, and comp. ib. 11. 8. 2. This perhaps led to the choice of the modified term $\kappa \omega \lambda \nu \delta \delta \nu \tau \omega \nu$.
тois $\pi \iota \sigma \tau$ ois ] 'for the fuitifful,' Hammond, Est. The ditt. is not the dat. of reference to, Bengel (compare notes on (ial. i. 22), still less for $\dot{\nu} \pi \delta \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \iota \sigma \tau \omega \bar{\omega}$ (Bloomf.), but marks the objects for whom the food was created. Bрш́ $\mu \alpha \boldsymbol{a}_{\alpha}$ were, indeed, created for all, but it was only in the case of the rıбtoi, after a receiving $\mu \in \tau \grave{\alpha}$ è̀ $X a p$. (condition attached), that the true end of creation was fully satisfied. $\kappa \alpha) \epsilon \in \pi \in \gamma \nu \omega \kappa \delta \sigma \iota \nu$ к.т. $\overline{\text {. } \mid ~ ' a n d ~ w h o ~ h a v e ~ f u l l ~ k n o w l e d g e ~ o f, ' ~}$ ete. : the omission of the article (IViner, (ir. § 19.4, p. 116) shows that the $\pi$ rotod and è $\pi \in \gamma \nu$. к. т. $\lambda$. constitute a single class, the latter term being little more than explanatory of the former (Estius).
 $\gamma^{\nu \omega} \sigma t s$, Coray), sec notes on Eph. i. 17, and Valck. on Luke, p. 14 sq.
4. $\delta$ ธт $\pi \hat{\alpha} \nu$ к.т. $\lambda$.] 'because every creature of God is good:' not explanatory of (Theoph., Beng.), but giving the reason for the foregoing words; i. e. nut what is called an objective (Donalds. Gr. § 584), but a causal sentence. The apostle has to substantiate his former declaration that meats are intended to be enjoyed with thanksgiving: this he does by the positive declaration (comp. Gen. i. 31) пầ ктí $\sigma \mu a$ Өєoû ка入óv (corresponding to $\hat{\varepsilon} \dot{\delta}$ Єє̀ेs $๕ \kappa \kappa \tau \iota \sigma \epsilon \nu$ ), supported and enhanced by the negative sentence, kal oúdèv $\kappa$. $\tau \cdot \lambda$. (parallel to $\epsilon$ is $\dot{\mu} \in \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} \lambda . \mu \in \tau \grave{\alpha} \epsilon \dot{\partial} \chi$.),
which again is finally confirmed by the declaration in v. 5. KTi $\sigma \mu \alpha$ is ouly here used by St. Paul, his usual expression being ктiбts. The argument, however, of Schleierm. based upon it is sufficiently answered by Planck, who cites several instances, e. g. тробкотŋ̀ 2 Cor. vi. 3, ó $\phi$ єì $\lambda \mu \mu$ Rom. iv. 4, etc., of words thus only once used when another and more usual synonym might have been expected. $\kappa \tau\{\sigma \mu \alpha \Theta \in o \hat{v}]$ 'creature of Giod,' 'every creation of his hand designed for food :'
 т $\omega \nu \eta$ pivi $\xi a \tau$, Chrys. The fact of its being His creation is enough ; єi ктi $\sigma \mu \alpha$ $\Theta \in о \hat{v}, \kappa \kappa \lambda o ́ \nu$, ib; ; comp. Ecclus. xxxix.
 be refused:' expansion of the former statement; not only was everything $\kappa a \lambda o \nu$, whether in its primary (' outwardIy pleasing,' каס-خós, Donalds. C'ratyl. § 324), or secondary and usual acceptation, but further, ' nothing was to be rejected.' It was a maxim even of the heathens that the good gifts of the gods were not to be rejected; so IIom. Il. inr. 65, compare Lucian, Timon, § 37, oû̃ou
 (cited by Kypke). The whole of this verse is well discussed by Bp. Sanderson, Serm. v. (ad I'opulum), p. 233 sq. (London 1689). $\mu \in \tau \grave{\alpha} \in \dot{\cup} \chi$. $\lambda \alpha \mu \beta$.] 'if it be received, etc. ; conditional use of the participle ; see Donalds. Gr. § 505, Krüger, Spruchl. §56. 11, and comp. Winer, Gr. $\$ 45.2$. This clause specially limits the assertion où $\delta \grave{e} \nu$ àmó $\beta \lambda$., and while it shows how the assertion is to be accepted serves also to echo and clucidate the previous limitation, $\mu \in \tau \grave{\alpha}$ è̀ $\chi$. in verse 3 . Wiesinger considers $\kappa \alpha \lambda \delta \nu$ as nlso dependant on $\mu \in \tau \grave{\alpha}$ e $\dot{\chi} \chi$. $\lambda a \mu \beta$., and not a positive and independent assertion. This, however, docs not seem satisfactory; for as the provious verse virtually contains two assertions,



Reject all idle teachings and discussion, and practically exercise thyse!f in godliness, which is lastingly protitable.



viz., that $\Theta \epsilon \dot{d} s$ そ̌ктเซє $\nu$ єis $\mu \epsilon \tau \dot{\alpha} \lambda$., and that the $\mu \epsilon \tau \dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \mu \mu \psi \stackrel{s}{ }$ was to be $\mu \epsilon \tau \dot{\alpha}$ є $\dot{u} \chi a p$., so the present verse contains two confirmatory clauses, viz., that the food being God's creation, is absolutely good (sce Sanderson, Serm. v. § 4), and also that if so, $\mu \in \tau \dot{\alpha} \epsilon_{\cup} \chi^{\chi} . \lambda \alpha \mu \beta a \nu \delta \mu$. it is oùk $\dot{\alpha} \pi \delta$ B入خtov, or relatively good as well. It is best then to retain the punctuation of Lachm. and Tisch.
 fiecl,',$i$, e. each time the food is partaken of ; present tense corresponding to $\lambda \alpha \mu$ Bavóuєvov. This verse is confirmatory of ver. 4 , especially of the latter clause ; the gencral and comprehensive assertion, that nothing is to be rejected or considered relatively unclean if partaken of with thanksgiving is substantiated by more nearly defining eủXapırтía and more clearly showing its sanctifying effect. 'Ayıá ${ }^{\prime} \in \iota \nu$ is thus not merely declarative, 'to account as holy,' but effective, 'to make holy,' 'to sanctify.' In some few things (e. g. eiowidisuta, Chrys.) the ágla $\sigma \mu \partial s$ might actually be aossolute in its character ; in others, whether pronounced legally àkdisapta, or accounted so by a false asceticism (c.g. the Essenes avoided wine and flesh on their weekly festival, Philo, Vit. Contempl. § 9, Vol. I1. p. 483), the $\dot{\alpha} \gamma t a \sigma \mu \partial s$ would naturally be relutive. Estius and Wiesinger seem to take $\delta \boldsymbol{\gamma}$ l$\alpha{ }_{\alpha}(\varepsilon \tau \alpha \iota$ as comprehensively absolute, and to refer the impurity of the $\kappa \tau i \sigma \mu \alpha$ to the primal curse ; but is this consistent with Matth. xv. 11, Rom. xiv. 14, 1 Cor. x. 25,26 , and can it be proved that the curse on the earth (Gen. iii. 17, observe especially the reading of the LXX, $\dot{\epsilon}^{2} t^{-}$

and see also Joseph. Ant. 1. 1. 4) took the special effect of unhallowing the animal or vegetable creation? If so, would not a law such as that in Lev. xix. 23, 24 , which applied to the polluted land of Canaan, have been of universal application? The effect of the primal curse is indeed most plain and palpable, (sec Destiny of Creature, p. 12 sq.), but it seems doubtful whether it is to be recog. nized in the special form here alluded to. $\lambda$ ó रou к.т. $\lambda$.] 'the word of God and supplication.' 'The regular and unvarying use of $\lambda 6$ ros $\Theta \in o \hat{v}$ in the N. T. wholly precludes the gen. being taken as ohjecti, -' oratio ad Deum facta,' Wahl. The $\lambda o ́ \gamma o s ~ \Theta \epsilon o \hat{v}$ is the word of God as uttered and revealed by Him in the Scriptures, and here, as the close union with $\check{\iota} \nu \tau \in \nu \xi$ gs clearly suggests, must be referred not to any decree of God (Sanders. Serm. v. § 39), but to the contents of the prayer; the word of God as involved and embodied in the terms of the prayer. Thus; as Wiesinger suggests, the idea of $\epsilon \dot{u} \chi \alpha$ plotía is expressed in the fullest manner; on its objective side as to the contents of prayer, and on its subjective side (è $\downarrow \tau v \gamma-$ $\left.\chi^{\alpha} \nu \epsilon เ \nu\right)$ as to the mode in which it is
 and for an ancient form of grace before meat, see Alf. in loc.
6. $\tau \alpha \hat{v} \tau \alpha$ ย์To $\operatorname{tin}$ ] 'By setting forth,' scil. 'if thou settest forth, teachest (Syr.), these things:' oùk єī $\pi \in \nu$ ѐ $\pi เ \tau a ́ r-$ $\tau \omega \nu$, oủk єìmє $\pi a \rho a \gamma \gamma \epsilon ́ \lambda \lambda \omega \nu$, à $\lambda \lambda \alpha ̀$ úmotin.,
 $\uparrow \in \sigma o$, Chrysostom. On the construction and more exact translation of the participle, see notes on ver. 16.
The reference of $\tau \alpha \hat{u} \tau \alpha$ is somewhat
doubtful．As ט́motinteatat（dynamic mid－ dle，－i．e．application of the simple mean－ ing of the active to mental and moral forces；see Krüger，Sprachl．§ 52．8．4， and compare notes on ch．i．16）seems clearly to imply not merely＇in memo－ riam revocare，＇Auth．Ver．，but＇docere，＇ ＇instituere，＇whether＇amice et leniter＇ （Loesn．；compare Philo，Vit．Mos．II．§ 9，Vol．II．p．142，ed．Mang．，vitotìiєtal

 in the present case，somewhat more pos－ itively and precisely，тঠ тараıveîv кal Bou入єúध $\sigma$ きat，Budæus（comp．Josephus
 סiautav，see examples in Krebs，Obs；p． 355 sq ．），tav̂̃a will most naturally refer to ver． 4,5 ，and to the principles and dissuasive arguments which it involves． See especially Raphel，Annot．Vol．Ir．p． 582，who well supports the latter mean－

$\delta \iota \alpha$ коvos］＇minister：＇＇thou wilt fitly and properly discharge thy $\delta$ saкорía， 2 Tim．iv． 5 ；＇tho muneri cumulatissime satisfacies，Just．$\quad \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \nu \tau \rho \in \phi \delta \mu \epsilon-$ vos］＇being nourished up．＇The pres－ ent properly and specially marks a con－ tinuous and permanent nutrition in＇the words of faith ；＇see Winer，Gr．§ 45.5 ， p．311．So，with his usual acuteness， Chrysost．，$\tau \grave{~ \delta ~ \delta ı \eta \nu \epsilon \kappa \epsilon ̀ s ~ \tau \hat{\eta} s ~ \epsilon i s ~ \tau \alpha ̀ ~ \tau o ん \alpha u ̂ \tau \alpha ~}$ $\pi \rho \circ \sigma o \chi \eta ิ s$ $\delta \eta \lambda \omega ิ \nu . ~ L o e s n e r ~ a p t l y ~ c o m-~$ pares，among other exx．（p．399，400）， Philo，Leg．ad Cai．§．29，Vol．II． 574
 ìns тoîs iepois $\gamma p a ́ \mu \mu \alpha \sigma t \nu$ ；compare also § 26，Vol．ix．p．571，and see D＇Orville， Chariton，p． 37 ：similar exx．of＇innu－ triri＇are cited in Suicer，Thesaur．s．v． Vol．x．p． 1127.
tois
入óvous $\tau \hat{\eta} s \pi i \sigma \tau \in \omega s$ ］＇the words of firith，＇gen．subjecti；＇words，terms，in which，as it were，faith expresses itself，＇ Iluther．חíatis，as Beng．suggests，in－
volves a reference to Tim．，$\dot{\eta}$ кa入خ）$\delta t-$ $\delta a \sigma \kappa$ ，a reference to others．On the meaning of $\pi i \sigma \tau t s$ ，see notes on Gal．i． 23，and Reuss，Theol．Chret．Vol．Ir．p． 127，who，however，too much gives up the subjective reference which the word always seems to involve．In the follow－ ing relative clause，if $\bar{\eta} s$ the reading of Lachm．［only with A，80］be adopted，it must be regarded as an instance of un－ usual，though defensible attraction ；see Winer，Gir．§ 24．1，p． 147. $\pi \alpha \rho \eta \kappa \circ \lambda \circ \cup \dot{v} \eta \kappa \alpha s$ ］＂hast closely fol－ lowed（as a disciple），hast been a follower of ；＇ 2 Tim．iii． 10 ；perf．in appropriate connection with the pres．，$\dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau \rho \in \phi \dot{\rho} \mu$ ． Паракодоэฟิєî̀（＇subsequi ut assequaris，＇ Valck．on Luke i．3）is frequently used with ethical reference（e．g．таракод．тoîs $\pi \rho \alpha{ }^{\gamma} \mu a \sigma t \nu$ ，Luke l．c．，Demosth．de Coron． p． 285 ；тарак．тoîs xpóvots，Nicom．ap． Athen．291）to denote＇tracing diligently out，＇＇attending to the course of，＇and thence，by an intelligible gradation，＇un－ derstanding the drift and meaning＇of any facts or subjects presented for con－ sideration ；see exx．of this latter mean－ ing in Kypke，Obs．Vol．I．p．207，and comp．Dissen，on Demosth．l．c．Both here，however，and 2 Tim．iii．10，the meaning appears to be simply，＇followed after，＇not merely in the sense of imitat－ ing a pattern（De W．on 2 Tim．l．c．），but of attending to a course of instruction，
 $\delta i \delta a \sigma k a \lambda i a$ was，as it were，a school of which Tim．＇was a disciple ；＇see Peile in loc．The Syr．$\Delta \mathrm{I}_{\Delta} \xrightarrow[x]{\text { as }}$ ？quam didicisti］and the Vulg．＇quam assecu－ tus es＇（compare Auth．Ver．）express rather too strongly the simple result，and too insufficiently the process by which it was attained．

7．Toùs $\delta$＇̀ $\beta \in \beta$ خे $\lambda$ ．к．$\tau . \lambda$ ．＇＇But with the（current）profone and old－wives＇
fables have nothing to do．＇The article （not noticed by the majorityof expositors） appeats to allude to the well－known character and the general circulation which the $\mu \hat{\imath} \hat{\Im}$ ot had obtained．These Jewish fables（Chrys．，see notes on ch．i． 4）are designated $\beta$ $\beta \beta \eta \lambda o l$ ，＇profane＇（ch． i． 9 ，vi． 20,2 Tim．ii．16，Heb．xii．16）， in tacit antithesis to evo é $\beta$ ．，as bearing no moral fruit，as lying out of the holy compass，and，as it were，on the wrong side of the $\beta \eta \lambda \partial{ }^{2} s$ of divine truths（comp．
 $\lambda s \gamma \delta \mu$ ．）as involving foolish and absurd statements．Wetstein aptly compares
 $\mu \nu$ vodoy＇à $\dot{\text { àmoфaivel．The assertion of }}$ Baur that $\gamma \rho \alpha \omega \bar{\sigma} \eta$ s points to a $\gamma \rho a i=$ ，the Sophia－Achamoth（comp．Gieseler，Kir－ chengesch．§ 45），is untenable；independ－ ently of other considerations，it may be remarked that $\gamma$ païrcos（Clemens Alex． Pced．11I．4，p．270，Pott）would have been thus more grammatically exact than the present $\gamma \rho a \omega \delta \eta s(\gamma \beta a \omega \in i \delta \eta s)$ ．
$\pi a \rho a \iota \tau \circ \hat{\nu}]$＇decline，have notling to do with，＇à áó申evye，Coray；ahways similarly used in the second person in the Pastoral Epp．，e．g．ch．v．11，and Titus iii． 10 （persons）， 2 Tim．ii． 23 （things）．Mapair． does not occur again in St．Paul＇s Epp．； it is，however，used three times in Heb． （xii．19，25，bis）and four times by St． Luke ：compare Joseph．Antiq．III．8．8， $\pi \alpha р а и т \eta \sigma \dot{\alpha} \mu \epsilon \nu 0 s ~ \pi a ̂ \sigma a \nu ~ \tau i \mu \eta \nu$ ．Loesner， Obs．p．404，gives a copious list of exx． from Philo，the most pertinent of which is Alleg．1II．§48，Vol．1．p． 115 （ed． Mang．），where троotépevos and пapaurov́－ $\mu$ evos are put in opposition ：see also notes on ch．v．11．$\gamma \dot{v} \mu \nu a \zeta \epsilon \delta^{6}$＇］＇and rathier exercise；＇so Auth．Ver．，correctly marking the $\delta \dot{\delta}$ ，which serves to present antithetically the positive side of the con－ duct Tim．is urged to assume．He is first negatively $\pi$ apaıteîỗaı $\mu$ ívous，then posi－
tively $\gamma v \mu \nu \alpha{ }^{\prime} \zeta_{\epsilon \nu \nu} \kappa . \tau . \tau$. The special term，
 14）appropriately marks the strenuous ef－ fort which Timothy was to make，in con－ trast with the studied $\check{\sigma} \sigma \kappa \eta \sigma$ ts of the false teachers．
$\pi \rho \partial s \in \dot{v} \sigma \in \in$ ．］ ＇for piety；＇＇vंréBela，＇practical，cultive， piety＇（see notes on ch．ii．2），wast the end toward which Timothy was to direct his endeavors．
8．$\gamma \grave{\alpha} \rho$ confirms the preceding clause by putting ruuva⿱ía $\sigma \omega \mu a \tau \kappa \kappa \dot{\prime}$ ，the out－ ward and the visible，in contrast with $\gamma \nu \mu \nu a \sigma$ ía $\pi \rho \partial s$ єivé $\beta$ ．，the internal and the unseen．$\dot{\eta} \sigma \omega \mu \alpha \tau \iota \kappa \grave{\eta}$ $\gamma \nu \mu \nu$ ．］＇the exercise，or training，of the
 corporis］．The exact meaning of these words is somewhat doubtful．「umvaria may be referred，either（a）to the mere pliysical training of the body，gymnastic exercises proper，De W．，Huther，and， as might be expected，Justin，Est．，Mack， al．；or（b）to the ascetic training of the body（ 1 Cor．ix． 27 ）in its most general
 Coray），with reference to the theosophis－ tic discipline of the false teachers，Tho－ mas Aq．，Matth．Wiesing．，al．Of these， （a）is not to be summarily rejected，as it was maintained by Chrys．，Theoplyl． （though on mistaken grounds），Theod．， Ecum．，and has been defended with some ingenuity by De Wette：sce Sui－ cer，Theseur．s．v．Vol．I．p．804．As， however，ruavacia is not uncommonly used in less special references（e．g．Aris－ tot．Top．viII．5，Polyb．Hist．I．1．2）， as $\gamma^{\prime} \mu \nu S_{\epsilon}{ }^{\prime}$（ver．7）prepares us for this modification， －as the context seems to require a contrast between external ob－ servances and inward holiness，－and， lastly，as ascetic practices formed so very distinctive a feature of that current Jew－ ish Theosophy（Joseph．Bell．Jud．II． 8.




2 sq., Philo, Vit. Contempl. § 4 sq.) which in this chapter appears so distinctly alluded to, it seems impossible to avoid deciding in favor of the latter interpretation ; so Beveridge, Serm. cI. Vol. Iv. p. 408 (A.-C. L.) Neander, Planting, Vol. 1. p. 340 (Bohn), and apparently the majority of modern expositors.
If it be urged that $\dot{\eta} \sigma \omega \mu a \tau \iota \dot{\eta} \gamma \nu \mu \nu$. (in this sense) was unrestrictedly condemned in ver 2, 3, and could never be styled
 enough to say that there the apostle is speaking of its morbid developments in the viatepol кatpol, here of the more innocent though comparatively profitless asceticism of the present.
 refer to the duration (Syr., Theod. ; compare James iv. 14) of the $\dot{\omega} \phi \in \in \lambda \epsilon \alpha$, or the extent to which it may be applied (Huther, De Wette). The context, however, and the antithesis $\pi \rho \partial{ }_{2} \pi \alpha \dot{d} \tau \tau$ seem decidedly in tavor of the latter, and to limit the meaning to 'a little' (ad modicum,' Vulg.) - 'the few oljects, ends, or circumstances in life,' toword which
 ily training and asceticism can be profitably directed.
€ $\chi \circ \cup \sigma a]$
'as it has, 'since it has ;' causal use of the participle (comp. Donalds. Gr. § 615 sq .) in contirmation of the preceding assertion. On the practical application of this clause see Barrow, Serm. II. III. Vol. 1. p. 23 sq. (Oxf. 1830).
$\dot{\epsilon} \pi \alpha \gamma \gamma \in \lambda\{a \nu$ 〔 $\omega \hat{\eta} s\}$ 'promise of life.' The geuitival relation is not perfectly clear. If it be the gen. of identity or apposition (comp. Scheuerl. Synt. § 12. 1, p. 82), § $\mathrm{m}_{\text {, the import or rather object of }}$ the promise, would seem at first sight to involve two applications, quantitative ('loug life,' Eph. vi. 3, De W.) when
in connection with $\tau \hat{\eta} s \quad \nu \hat{\nu} \nu$, qualitative (' holy, blessed life,') when in connection with $\tau \hat{\eta} s \mu \in \lambda \lambda o v \in \sigma j$ s. If again it be the gen. of reference to (Huth., comp. Alf.), or if the point of view (Scheuerl. Synt. § 18. 1, p. 129 sq.$)$, ( $\omega$ خे retains its general meaning ('vital existence,' etc.), but '̇$\pi a \gamma \gamma \in \lambda i ́ a$ becomes indefinite, and moreover is in a comnection with its dependant genitive not supported by any other passage in the N. T. This last objection is so grave that it seems preferable to adopt the first form of genitive, but in both members to give $\langle\omega \eta$ its higher and more definitely scriptural sense, and to regard it as involving the idea, not of mere length, or of mere material blessings ('bona et commoda hujus vite,' Calv., contrast Mark X. $30, \mu \in \tau \alpha, \delta!\omega \gamma-$ $\mu \bar{\omega} \nu$ ), but of spiritual happiness ( $\epsilon \dot{u} \delta a \mu \mu^{-}$ vía, Coray) and holiness; in a word, as expressing 'the highest blessedness of the creature:' see 'Trench, Synon. \$ 27 , whose philology, however, in connecting ( $\omega$ गे with ${ }^{\prime} \omega$ is here doubtful ; it is rather connected with Lat. 'vivere' (Sanscrit jiv) ; see especially Pott, Etym. Forsch. Vol. I. p. 265, Donalds. Cratyl. § 112, Benfey, Wurzellex. Vol. x. p. 684. There is a good treatise on $\zeta \omega \eta$ in Olsh. Opusc. p. 187 sq . $\quad \tau \hat{\gamma_{1} s} \nu \hat{v} \nu$ к. r. $\lambda$.] The two independent parts into which the life promised to $\epsilon \dot{v} \sigma \in \in \in \iota a$ is divided, life in this world and that which is to come : the promises of the old covenant are involved and incorporated in the New (Taylor, Life of C'hrist, 111. 13, Disc. 15. 15), and enhanced. On the use of the art., which thus serves to mark each part as separate, comp. Winer, Gr. § 19. 5, p. 117.
9. $\pi \imath \sigma \tau \delta s \delta$ дóqos к.т. $\lambda$.] See notes on ch. i. 15 ; here the formula is confirmatory of what immediately pre-


cedes, $\tau \delta$, ö $\tau \iota \dot{\eta} \epsilon \dot{\nu} \sigma \epsilon \beta$. $\dot{\omega} \phi \in \lambda \epsilon \hat{\imath}$ кal̂ $\epsilon i s \tau \eta \eta_{\eta} \nu$ тарои̂णav, каі єis тो̀ $\nu \mu \in \lambda \lambda$. ऊ $\omega \grave{\eta} \nu$, єîvat
 ern Greek]. The particle $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$, ver. 10 , obviously precludes any reference to what follows (Conyb.) ; compare notes on ch. iii. 1 .
10. $\mathrm{\epsilon}$ is tồ 0 o $\gamma^{\prime} \mathrm{\rho} \mathrm{p}$ ] 'For looking to this,' (Col. i. 29, comp. Donalds. Cratyl. § 170), 'in reference to this,' viz. the realization of the promise in our own cases :

 àvi $i \delta o \sigma t s$, Theod. The reference of $\epsilon$ is тoûto (by no means synonymous with סiò $\tau 0 \hat{u} \tau o$, Grot.) 't the following 8 ช $\tau$, , 'therefore we both labor etc., because,' Atuth. Ver. (comp. Theophyl., Beza, al.), has been recently defended by Wiesinger; but surely this interrupts the causal connection ( $\gamma$ à $\rho$ ) with ver. 8 , and its confirmatory sequel ver. 9. It is not necessary to restrict тồto to $\bar{\epsilon} \pi \alpha \gamma \gamma \in \lambda$. ऽ $\omega \hat{\eta} s$ $\tau \hat{s} \mu \in \lambda \lambda o v ́ \sigma \eta s$ (Weising.), for although this would naturally form the chief end of the котtâ $\nu$ and $\dot{o} \nu \in i \delta i \zeta \in \sigma \sim \sim \alpha l$, still $\zeta \omega \grave{\eta}$ (in its extended sense) $\dot{\eta} \nu \hat{\nu} \nu$ might also suitably form its object, as being a kind of pledge and $\dot{\alpha} \dot{\rho} \rho \dot{\rho} \beta \dot{\omega} \nu$ of $\zeta \omega \dot{\eta} \dot{\eta} \dot{\eta}^{\prime} \dot{\epsilon} \lambda$ : $\lambda$ оиба.
$\kappa \alpha i \kappa o \pi \iota \omega \mu \in \nu$ $\kappa \tau . \lambda$.$] 'we both labor and are the objects$ of reproach; ' not merely St. Paul alone (Col. i. 29), or St. Paul and Timothy, but the apostles in general ( 1 Cor, iv. 12), and all Christian missionaries and teachers. Kotıáw is frequently used in reference to both apostolic and ministerial labors (Rom. xvi. 12, 1 Cor. xy. 10, Gal. iv. 11, al.), with allusion, as the derivation (кот-, ко́тт $\omega$, - not Sanscr. kap, Benfey, Wurzellex. Vol. 1. p. 268] suggests, to the toil and suffering which accompanied them. The reading is not perfectly certain ; the first kal is omitted in thie important mss., ACD ; majority
of Vv. ; Chrys., Dam., and Latin Ff.;
 (Lachm.) in ACFGK, but apparently with only one version, Syr. (Philox.), and with only seven mss. The latter readiug is suspicious as being easier, and as having possibly originated from Col. i. 29. The former (the omission of kal) is more specious ; the insertion, however, which is well supported ( FGKL , and nearly all mss.; see Tïsch.), gives a force and emphasis which seems peculiarly appropriate, comp. 1 Cor. iv. 11 : not only, 'toil and shame' (kaí), nor ' where toil, there shame' ( $т \in-\kappa \alpha i)$, but 'as well the one as the other' (каi-каi'), both parts being simultaneously presented in one predication; see Winer, Gr. § 53. 4, p. 389, and compare Donalds. Ciatyl. § 189, 195, pp. 322, 338.
$\eta \lambda \pi i \kappa \alpha \mu \in \nu]$ 'lave set our hope on,' 'have set and do set hope on,' - the perfect expressing the continuance and permanence of the é $\lambda \pi i$; see Bernhardy, Synt. x. 6, p. 378, and compare ch. v. 5, vi. 17 , John v. 45,2 Cor. i. 10. Peile and Wiesinger compare 1 Cor. xv. 19,
 gotten that there $\grave{\eta} \lambda \pi$. $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \mu \dot{\nu} \nu$ is not merely $=\eta$ ク $\lambda \pi i \kappa \alpha \mu \in \nu$; see Meyer in loc. 'E $\lambda \pi i \zeta \omega$, like $\pi \iota \sigma \tau \in v \in \omega$ (comp. notes on ch. i. 16), is found in the N. T. in connection with different prepositions; $(a)$ with $\stackrel{\epsilon}{\epsilon}, 1$ Cor. xv. 19, 'spes in Christo reposita; ' (b) with eis, John v. 45, 2 Cor. i. 10, 1 Pet. iii. 5 (Lachm., Tisch.), marking the direction of the hope with perhaps also some faint (locative) notion of union or communion with the object of it; comp. notes on ch. i. 16, and on Gal. iii. 27 : (c) with $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \dot{l}$ and dat., ch. vi. 17, Rom. xv. 12 (LXX), marking the basis or foundation on which the hope rests ; (d) with $\epsilon \pi l$ and acc. (ch. v. 5), marking the mental direction with a view to that reli-

Let not thy youth induce contempt；be rather a mod－ el．Neglect not thy spirit－ ual gifts，but persevere in all thy duties．

## ${ }_{11}$ Пари́भүєл入є таи̂та каі̀ סiōaбкє．，${ }^{12} \mu \eta$－



ance ；comp．Donalds．Gr．§ 483．The simple dative is found（Lachm．，Tisch．） in Matth．xii． 21 （LXX）．
\％ैs है $\sigma \tau \iota v \kappa_{0}$ т．入．］＇who is the Saviour of all men ；＇relative clause，not，how－ ever，with any causal or explanatory force（this would more naturally be ठa $\sigma \tau s$ ），but simply declaratory and defin－ itive．The declaration is made to arouse the feeling that the same God who is a living，is a loving God，one in whom their trust is not placed in vain；the Saviour here and hereafter（Chrys．，Theoph．）of all men，chiefly，especially，of them that believe．De Wette objects to the use of $\mu \dot{\alpha} \lambda \wedge \sigma \tau \alpha$ ；surely the primary notion of $\mu \dot{d} \lambda a$, ＇in a great degree＇［closely con－ nected with $\mu \epsilon \gamma \dot{\alpha} \lambda \alpha$ ，compare＇moles ；＇ Pott，Etym．Forsch．Vol．I．p．283］，is here perfectly suitable and proper；God is the $\sigma \omega T \lambda^{\prime} p$ of all men，in the greatest degree of the $\pi$ tovol ；i．e．the greatest and fullest exhibition of His $\sigma \omega \tau \eta \rho i a$, its complete realization，is seen in the case of the тıotot ；comp．Gal．vi．10．There is involved in it，as Bengel observes， an argumentum $a$ minori；＇＇quanto magis eam（Dei beneficentiam）experienter pii qui in cum sperant，＇Calv．On this im－ portant text sec four sermons by Barrow， Works，Vol．Iv．p． 1 sq．（Oxf．1830）．
11．$\tau a \hat{v} \tau a]$＇these things，not merely
 （Wegsch．），nor，on the other hand，more inclusively＇omnia quæ dixi de magno pietatis sacram．，＇etc，but，$\tau \delta \begin{gathered}\text { è } \nu \in \dot{d} \sigma \in \beta \text { ．} \\ \text { ．}\end{gathered}$

 all the statements included between the last raîra（ver．6）and the present repe－ tition of the pronoun．
жapá $\gamma \gamma \in \lambda \lambda \epsilon$ ］＇command，＇Vulgate， Goth．，Auth．Ver．；not＇exhort，＇Ham－ mond，or＇mone privatim，＇Grot．，but in
the usual and proper sense，＇pracipe，＇ ènitatte，Chrysost．，who thus explains the use of each term ：$\tau \widehat{\omega} \nu \pi \rho a \gamma \mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu \tau \grave{\alpha}$



 סıбабка入ías хре́＇a，Homil．xıII．init．
12．$\mu \eta \delta \in$ ís $\sigma o u$ к．т．ג．］＇Let no one despise thy youth；＇oov being con－ nected，not directly with кaraфp．，－＇de－ spiciat te ob juvenilem ætatem＇（Bretsch． Lex．；comp．Leo，al．），but with the fol－ lowing gen．$\tau \hat{\text { îs }} \nu \in$ é́r $\eta$ Tos．The former construction is grammatically tenable （Winer，Gr．§ 30．9，p．183），but is not supported by the use of karapp．in the N．T．，and is not required by the con－ text．It has been doubted whether this command is addressed（a）indirectly to the Church（Huth．），in tho sense，＇no man is to infringe on jour authority，＇
 Chrys．1，or（b）simply to Tim．，in the sense，＇let the gravity of thy life supply the want of years，＇Hamm．，Chrys．2，al． The personal application of the next
 decidedly in favor of（b）；＇do not only， negatively，give no reason for contempt， but，positively，be a living example．＇
There is no difficulty in the term $\nu \in \dot{d} \tau \eta \mathrm{n}$ applied to Timothy．It is in a high de－ gree probable（see Acts xvi．1－3）that Timothy was young when he first joined the apostle（A．D． 50 ，Wieseler）：if he were then as much as twenty－five he would not be more than thirty－eight（ac－ cording to Wieseler＇s chronology），or forty（accorling to Pearson＇s）at the as－ sumed date of this Epistle－a relative $\nu \in$ érns when contrasted with the func－ tions he had to exercise，and the age of those（ch．v． 1 sq ）he had to overlook．
à $\lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha} \tau \operatorname{vi\pi os} \kappa . \tau . \lambda_{\text {.] }}$ 'but become an example, model, for the believers:' $\uparrow$ '̇ $\lambda \in \operatorname{sis}$,
 ขó $\mu$ os' $\gamma \in \nu 0 \hat{v}$, Theod. Tútos is similarly applied in a moral sense, 1 Pet. v. 3, Phil. iii. 17, 1 Thess. i. 7, 2 Thess. iii. 9, Tit. ii. 7 ; comp. Rom. vi. 17. In the following words the insertion of a comma after $\pi เ \sigma \tau \bar{\omega} \nu($ Lachim., Tisch $)$ is distinctly to be preferred to the ordinary punctuation (Mill, Scholz), as serving to specify with greater force and clearness the qualities and conditions in which the example of Timothy is to be shown. There is, indeed, as Huther suggests, a kind of order preserved in the five substantives which seems designed and significant; Words, whether in teaching or in social intercourse ; Conduct (comp. notes on Transl. and on Eph. iv. 22), as evinced in actions; Love and Faith, motive forces in that inner Christian life of which words and conduct are the outward manifestations : Purity Syr. $1 \frac{20}{2} 0{ }^{\nabla}$ ? ; not ' castitate,' Vulg., Beng., either here or ch. v. $2,-$ (on the true meaning of $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \nu b$ s, see notes on ch. v. 2), the prevailing characteristic of the life as outwardly manifested and developed. The omissions of the article in this list might be thought to confirm the canon of Harless, Eph. p. 29, 'that abstracts which specify the qualities of a subject are anarthrous,' if that rule were not wholly indemonstrable: see Winer, G'r. § 19, 1, p. 109. The addition, ${ }^{2} \nu \quad \pi \nu \in \cup ́ \mu a \tau \iota$, Rec. (only found in KL; great majority of mss. ; Arab. [Polygl.] ; Theod., Dam., al.), is rightly rejected by Larhm.; Tisch., and most recent cditors. It might have crept into the text from 2 Cor. vi. 6 ; comp. Mill, Prolegom. p. 61.
 the present is perhaps used rather than

(Luke xv. 4, xvii. 8 [Lachm., Tisch., ], al , compare Herm. de Part. ă $\nu$, ıı. 9, p. 110 sq.), as implying the strong expectation which the apostle had of coming,
 compare Luke xix. 13, John xxi. 22, and Winer, Gr. § 40. 2, p. 237. On the constructions of cems see Klotz, Devar. Vol. II. p. 505 sq.
$\pi \rho \sigma \sigma \in \chi \in]$ 'apply (thyself), diligently attend to;' compare notes on chap. i. 4. The meaning here and ch. iii. 8, appears a little stronger than in ch. i. 4 and iv. 1 ;
 oov, and the good list of exx. in Rost u. Palm, Lex. s. v. 3. c, Vol. I1. p. 1192. $\tau \hat{\eta} \dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha \gamma \nu \omega \sigma \in \iota]$ 'the (public) reading' of the Scriptures, the Old, and probably (comp. Col. iv. 16, 1 Thess. v. 27, and Thiersch, Hist. of Church, Vol. 1. p. 14ī, Transl.) parts of the New Testament: compare Acts xiii. 15, $\tau \grave{\nu} \nu$ ả $\nu a ́ \gamma \nu$. 兀ôv vó $\mu o v ; 2$ Cor. iii. 14, è $\pi l$ т $\hat{n}$ à $\nu a \gamma \nu \omega \dot{\sigma} \epsilon \iota$ $\tau \bar{\eta} s$ тa入aiâs $\delta \iota \alpha \lambda$ ink $\eta$. On the public reading of the Scriptures in the early church, see Bingham, Antiq. xıIr. 4, 2, and comp. notes on Gal. iv. 21.
$\left.\tau \hat{\eta} \pi \alpha \rho \alpha \kappa \lambda \dot{\eta} \sigma \in t \dot{\kappa}, \tau . \lambda_{.}\right]$' the 'exhortation, the teuching:' both terms occur again together, Rom. xii. 7, 8. The distinction usually made between $\pi$ ара́к $\lambda$. and $\delta \delta \delta$., as respectively 'public exhortation' and 'private instruction,' seems very doubtful. Both appear to mark a form of public address, the former (as the derivation suggests, compare Theod.) possibly directed to the feelings, and apparently founded on some passage of Scripture (see especially Acts xiii. 15, and Just. M. Apol. 1. 67, where, however, the true reading is $\pi \rho o \sigma_{\kappa \kappa \lambda \eta \sigma t s), ~ t h e ~}^{\text {a }}$
 more to the understanding of the hearers; perhaps somewhat similar to the (now obscured) distinction of 'sermon' and 'lecture.' On סьסađк. compare notes on




Eph. iv. 11, and Suicer, Thesaurus s. v. Vol. r. p. 901.
14. $\mu \grave{\eta}$ à $\mu \epsilon ́ \lambda \epsilon t$ ] 'Be not neglectful of,' i. e. 'do not leave unexercisel;'
 $\mu a$. The following word $\chi$ d́ $\rho \sigma \mu \alpha$, with the exception of 1 Pet. iv. 10 , occurs only in St. Paul's Epp, where it is found as many as fourteen times, and in all cases denotes 'a gift emanating from the IKoly Spirit or the free grace of God.' Here probably, as the context suggests, it principally refers to the gifts of $\pi a p d \kappa \lambda \eta \sigma$ ts and $\delta \mathbf{\delta} \delta a \sigma \kappa$. just specified; comp. Rom. xii. 6-8. On the later use to denote Baptism (Clem. Alex. Pcedag. y. 6, Vol. 1. 113, ed. Pott.), see Suicer, Thesaur. Vol. in. p. 1503.
$\epsilon \nu \nu \sigma 0$ 亿
The parallel passage, 2 Tim. i. 6 , clearly develops the force of the prep. : the $\chi^{\alpha}$ pır $\mu \alpha$ is as a spark of holy fire witiin him, which he is not to let die out from want of attention; comp. Taylor, Forms of Liturg. § 22, 23.
$\delta \iota \alpha \mathrm{m} \rho \circ \phi \eta \tau \in\{\alpha s]$ 'by means of, by the medium of prophecy.' The meaning of this preposition has been neediessly tampered with : $\delta \dot{a}$ (with gen.) is not for $\delta \dot{\alpha}$ a with acc. (Just.), nor for $\epsilon$ is, nor for ${ }^{\epsilon} \nu$ (Beza), nor even, 'under inspiration,' Peile, but simply points to the medium through which the gift was given: comp. Hofmann, Sclrififb. Vol. 11. p. 256. The close union of $\pi \rho \circ \phi$. with $\overline{\epsilon \pi} \uparrow \mathfrak{\vartheta}$. $\chi \leftarrow เ \rho \bar{\omega} \nu$ ( $\mu \epsilon \tau \grave{\alpha}$ points to the concomitant act, Winer, Gr. § 47. h, p. 337) renders the סià perfectly intelligible: prophecy and imposition of hands were the two co-existent (Krüger, Sprachl. § 68. 13. 1) circumstances which made up the whole process (comp. De Wette), by the medium of which the $\chi$ d́p $\sigma \mu a$ was imparted. Tho association of ס̀à with èmıे. $\chi$ Efp. is so perfectly regular (Acts viii. 18, 2 Tim. i.
6), that its use with $\pi \rho o \phi$. gains by the association a kind of reflected elucidi-
 (Conc. Nie. xix. Conc. Chalecd. xy.) was a symbolic action, probably derived from the Jewish oְen (see Schoetty. IIor. Vol. 1. p. 874), the outward sign of an inward communication of the Holy Spirit (Acts viii. 17, ix. 17) for some spiritual office (Acts vi. 6) or undertaking (Acts xiii. 3), implied or expressed : (comp. Wiesinger in loc., Neand. Planting, Vol. I. p. 155 (Bohn), and especiallyHammond's treatise, Works, Vol. 1. p. $632-650$ ed. 1684). In the carly church only the superior orders of clergy, not the sub-deacons, readers, etc. (hence

 6, and IV. 6. 11.
$\pi \rho \in \sigma \beta v \tau \in \rho\left[\begin{array}{l}\text { o }] ~ ' p r e s h y t e r y, ' ~ ' c o n f r a-~\end{array}\right.$ ternity of presbyters' at the place where Timothy was ordained (perhaps Lystra, if we assume that the ordination closely followed his association with St. Paul) who conjointly with the apostle (2 Tim. i. 6) laid their lhands on him. П $\quad$ 覑 tépoo (used in Luke xxii. 66 and Acts xxii. 5 for the Jewish Sanhedrin) occurs very often in the epp. of Ignatius, in the present sense (Trall. 7, 13, Plilud. 7, al.), to denote the college of $\pi \rho \epsilon \sigma \beta u \dot{\tau} \epsilon \rho o l$, the ouvézplov $\Theta$ Єou (Trall. 3) in each particular city or district: comp Thorndike, Prim. Gov. xır. 9, Vol. I. p. 75 (A.C. Libr.).
15. $\tau \alpha \hat{v} \tau \alpha \mu \in \lambda \epsilon \in \tau \alpha$ ] 'practise these things, exercise thyself in these things,' Hammond, Scholef. Hints, p. 119; partial antithesis to $\mu \grave{\eta}$ à $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \in \epsilon$, verse 14. Me $\lambda e \tau d \omega$ only occurs again in the N . T. in a quotation from the LXX, $\Lambda$ cts iv.
 $\mu \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \tau a ̂ \tau \epsilon$ (rejected by Tisch. and placed

in brackets by Lachn.), is very doubtful. As there is thus no definite instance from which its exact meaning can be elicited in the N. T., it seems most accurate to adopt the prevailing meaning of the word, not 'meditari,' Vulg., Clarom., Syr., Arm. (though the idea of 'thinking about' really does form the primary idea of its root, Donalds. Cratyl. § 472), but 'exercere,' ' diligenter tractare,' Bretsch., d̀ $\sigma \kappa$ eiv, Hesych. ; compare Diog. Laert. Epicur. х. 123, $\tau \alpha \hat{\tau} \tau \alpha$ тра́ттє каl $\mu \in \lambda$ र̇ $\tau \alpha$ (cited by Wetst.), and see esp. the exx. in Raphel, Annot. Vol. i1. p. 586. The tramsl. of Conyb. (comp. Alf.), after De Wette, 'let these things be thy care' would be more appropriate to тaî̃á $\sigma$, $\mu \in \lambda$ ét $\omega$, comp. Hom. Ill. v. 490, xvili. 463.

Ėv toútors [ant]
' be occupied, spend thy time, in these things,'
Hamm. ; ' hoc age, his in rebus esto occupatus,' Valck. on Luke ii. 49, compare
 Tो̀ $\eta \boldsymbol{\eta} \mu \epsilon \in \rho a v$, and examples in Wakefield, Sylv. Crit. Vol. iv. p. 198 : a stronger enunciation of the foregoing words, corresponding to $\begin{gathered}\pi \\ T\end{gathered} \mu \in \nu \in \kappa$ к. $\tau$. $\lambda$. in ver. 16. $\pi \rho о \kappa 0 \pi$ 亿́] 'advance,' 'progress;' only here and Phil. i. 12, 25 (with a dependant gen.) : 'non immerito hæe vox a Grammaticis contemta est, quæ nullum antiquunn nedurn Atticum auctorem habet,' Lobeck, Phryn. p. 85. The 'advance ' may be in godliness generally, 2 Tim. iii. 17 (De Wette), but more probably in all the particulars mentioned ver. 12-14; compare Clurys. $\mu \grave{\eta}$ 辰 $\tau \hat{\varphi} \beta \hat{\beta} \varphi$
 $\lambda \varkappa \varkappa \hat{\varphi}$, except that this throws the empha-
 curious that Raphel, neither here nor on Phil. i. 12, 25, should have adverted to the not uncommon use of the word by

Polyb. e. g. Hist. I. 12. 7, 11. 45. 1, 111. 4. 2 , al.
16. द̈ $\pi \bar{\epsilon} \chi \in$ к. т. $\lambda$.] ' Give heed unto thyself (thy demeanor and conduct, ver. 12), and unto the doctrine which thou dost deliver, ver. 13.' 'ETÉ $\chi \in \operatorname{lil}$ ('to tix altention upon,' 'สтוкeĩoेau, Hesych., Suid.) is somewhat similarly used in Luke xiv. 7, Acts iii. 5, comp. 2 Mace. ix. 25 ; not Phil. ii. 16 (Theodoret), where $\lambda$ drov
 Syr., al., or more probably 'pretendentes,' Beza, al.; see notes in loc. St. Luke mainly uses the formula $\pi \rho o \sigma$ '́ $\chi \in \stackrel{1 \nu}{ }$ ধ́auTஸ̂, Luke xii. 1, xvii. 3, xxi. 34, Acts $\mathrm{v} .35, \mathrm{xx} .27$. The difference in meaning is very slight; ėméxell is perhaps rather stronger, the idea of 'rest upon' being probably united with that of simple direction, see Rost u. Palm, Lex, s. v. c. 3, Vol. r. p. 1045. Timothy was to keep his attention fixed both upon himself and his teaching; his teaching was to be good (ch. iv. 6) and salutary (cli. i. 10), and he himself was practically to exemplify it both in word and deed (ver. 12). $\quad \underset{\pi}{i}\{\mu \in \nu \in a \dot{v} \tau 0 \hat{\imath} s]$ 'continue in thent;' comp. Col. i. 23,
 vi. 1, xi. 22, 23, Phil. i. 24 : this tropical use of $\dot{k} \pi / \mu$. is thus peculiar to St. Paul. The reference of aủroîs has been very differently explained. By comparing the above examples of the apostle's use of $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \mu$. with a dat., it would seem nearly certain that à̀roîs must be neuter: if the apostle had here designed to refer to persons (aủroîs mase. ; see Grot., Beng.) he would more probably have used $\pi \rho \delta s$ with an accusative ; comp. 1 Cor. xvi. 7, Gal. i. 18. Aùrà may then be referred either to the details implied in è $\pi \in \chi \epsilon$ к. т. $\lambda$., or perhaps more probably to all

Behavior of Timothy toward the elder and younger members of the church. Distinctions to be observed in the support of widows.


 фàs ẻv $\pi a ́ \sigma \eta$ áyveíą. ${ }^{3}$ X Xípas típa tàs ővtos Xípas.
the points alluded to in verse 12 sq. (Math., Hither), so as to form a final recapitulatory echo, as it were, of the тâ̂т and тoúrots, ver. 15.
тоขิто $\gamma \alpha \rho$ к. т. $\lambda$.$] 'for by doing this,'$ etc.; confirmatory clause. The present part. is used with a similarly gerundial force (Comp. Herm. Soph. Elect. 57) in ver. 6 , where it is also better to preserve the more exact participial translation. This form of protasis involves a temporal reference (rather, however, too fully expressed by Syr. perhaps be distinguished from $\epsilon i$ with pres. indic., or ${ }^{\text {ea }} v$ with pres. subj., with either of which it is nearly synod. (Donalds. Gr. § 505), as connecting a little more closely the action of the verb in the protasis with that of the verb in the apodosis. It is singular that De Wette assigns a higher meaning to $\sigma \omega \omega_{\zeta} \epsilon \nu$ in reference to Timothy, but a lower ('Befestigung ') in reference to his hearers. In both it has its normal and proper sense, not merely 'servabis ne seducammini,' Bengel (comp. Theod.), but 'salvum facies,' Vulg., 'salvabis,' Clarom., and, as Wiesinger well remarks, conveys this important truth, ' that in striving to save others, tho minister is really caring for his own salvation.' On the force of каl -каi, see notes on ver. 10.

Chapter V. 1. $\pi \rho \in \sigma \beta v \tau \in \rho \varphi]^{\prime} a n$ elder.' Auth. Vcr., i. e. an elderly man,' not 'a preshyter; so Syr., Vulg. : $\bar{\alpha} p a$
 тঠ̀ $\begin{aligned} & \\ & \text { б }\end{aligned}$ рако́тоs, Chrys. This interpretaton is rendered nearly certain by the antithetical $\nu \in \omega \tau \epsilon \in \rho o u s$ in the following verse, and by $\dot{\omega} s \pi \alpha \tau \epsilon \rho \alpha$ in the adversative
clause. The exhortation, as Leo observes, follows very suitably after the reference (ch. iv. 12) to the $\nu$ еóт $\eta \mathrm{s}$ of Tim., 'ita se gerat erga seniors ut reverâ deceat virum juniorem.'
$\mu \grave{\eta} \epsilon \pi \imath \pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \xi \eta s$ ] 'do not sharply rebuke, reprimand.' 'E $\pi เ \pi \lambda \eta$ no $\tau \tau \in ⿺ \nu$ (an ä $\pi$. $\lambda \in \gamma \delta \mu \in \nu 0 \nu$ in the N. Test.), Syriac $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{5}^{y}$
 aù $\sigma \tau \in \rho \dot{\tau} \eta \tau \tau a$, Coral (mod. Greek), seems to involve the notion of sharpness and severity: $\tau \grave{\iota}$ é $\pi เ \pi \lambda . \kappa \alpha l$ к $\delta \pi \tau \epsilon เ \nu \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \in \tau \alpha \iota . .$.
 yous $\epsilon \pi เ \pi \lambda \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma \sigma \in L \nu \in \notin \rho \eta \tau \alpha l$, Eustathius. on Homer, ll. x. 500 (cited by Wetstein). The usual form in the New Testament is $\dot{\epsilon} \pi เ \tau!\mu \tilde{\alpha} \nu$, used very frequently by the first three evangelists, but only once by St. Paul, 2 Tim. iv. 2. $\nu \in \omega \tau \dot{\epsilon} \rho$ ovs] The grammatical construction requires тарака́ $\lambda \epsilon \iota$ to be supplied. The context, however, seems to suggest a more generat word, e. g. עovき̂́тat (comp. 2 Thess. iii. 15, yous $\epsilon \tau \epsilon i \tau \epsilon ~ \dot{\omega} s ~ \alpha \dot{\alpha} \delta \in \lambda \phi \dot{\partial} \nu$ ), a mean term, as it were, between $\bar{\epsilon} \pi i \pi \lambda \eta \tau \tau \epsilon$ and тарака́ $\lambda \epsilon$. This, however, was probably not inserted on account of the following $\pi \rho \in \sigma \beta u \tau \epsilon \in \rho a s$, where a milder term, would again be more appropriate.
2. $\epsilon \nu \pi \pi \dot{\alpha} \sigma \eta \dot{\alpha} \gamma \nu \in \dot{i} \mathfrak{a}]$ 'in all purity;' with exclusive reference to the $\nu \in \omega \tau \epsilon \in \rho a s$ : the bishop was so to order his conversadion to the younger women of his flock, with such purity, as not to afford any ground even for suspicion (Chrysost.). The rule of Jerome (Exist. 2) is simple; 'ones paellas et virgines Christi ant æqualiter ignora naut æqualiter dilige.'
3. $\chi$ nipas $\tau ; \mu a]$ 'pay due regard to widows,' Conyb. The meaning of $\tau \iota \mu d \omega$ and the connection of the following ver-
ses, $3-16$, has been from the earliest times so much a matter of dispute, that it is very difficult to arrive at a certain decision. On the whole, when we observe the economic terms, ả $\mu o t \beta \grave{\alpha} s \dot{\alpha} \pi{ }^{2} \delta \delta \delta$. (ver. 4), $\pi \rho о \nu=$ кiv (ver. 8), and esp. ' $\pi$ тарк tais övt $\omega$ 朕paus (ver. 16), it seems best with De Wette (after Theodoret, al.) to give rípa a somewhat extended meaning, 'honor,' not by a simple exhibition of
 $\mu_{\epsilon \in \nu}^{\prime} a l$, Chrys., - a somewhat insufficient reason), but also by giving material proofs
 ophyl. The translation of Peile, al.,
 oúvas, Coray (Romaic), involves too great a departure from the simple sense ; the context, however, does certainly seem to require some intermediate translation, which, without obscuring the primary and proper meaning of $\tau \not \mu \alpha \dot{\alpha} \omega$, may still leave the latter and less proper meaning fairly discernible: comp. $\tau \iota \mu \hat{\jmath} s$ ver. 17, Matth. xv. 4 sq. If this view be correct, ver. $3-8$ will seem to relate specially to the support widows are to receive, ver. $9-16$ to their qualifications for an office in the church ; sce Wieseler, Chronol. p. 309 , and notes on ver. 9 . On the position which willows occupied in the early church, see Bingham, Antiq. viI. 4. 9, Winer, RWB. Art 'Witwen.'
$\tau \grave{s}$ ŏvт $\omega s$ रйpas] 'who are vidows indeed:' i. e. as ver. 4,5 , and especially rer. 16, clearly explain it, - destitute and
 $\mu i \alpha \nu \beta o \eta \ni \ni \epsilon a \nu$, Coray. There seems then no sufficient ground either (a) for assigning to $\chi$ ńpa its ecclesiastical sense (Baur, Paulus, p. 497, who compares Ignatius Smyrn. 13, Tàs mapîṫvous tàs $\lambda \in \gamma o \mu \epsilon ́ v a s$ $\chi$ ŋ̀pas; see Coteler in loc. Vol. 11. p. 38),
 opp. to a $\chi \eta$ poa in the official meaning of

a strictly ethical reference, 'bona vidua et proba,' Leo ; for the 'nervus argumenti ' in both cases, viz. the clause
 clusively the religious attitude, but the earthly isolation of $\dot{\eta}$ öv $\omega \omega$ s $\chi \dot{\eta} \rho a$, and her freedom from the distractions of ordinary domestic lifo; comp 1 Cor. vii. 33,34 , and, thus far, Neander, Planting, Vol. I. p. 154 (Bohn).
4. єi $\delta$ є́ тıs $\chi$ ท́pa] ' But if any wid$o w$, ' $i . e$. 'in every case in which a widow has,' etc. ; comp. Syriac, where this evident opposition to $\dot{\eta} \not \partial \partial \nu \tau \omega s \chi$. is still more distinctly maintained. Having spoken of the 'widows indeed,' the apostle proceeds to show still more clearly his meaning by considering the case of one who does not fall under that class.
'́к кора] 'descendants,' or more specially , as the context implies, 'grundchitdren;' 'children's children,' Syr. 'nephews,' Auth. Ver.,-in the original, but now antiquated sense of the word ; compare Thom. M. p. 850 (ed. Bern.). The term ér \%ovov only occurs here in the N . T., but is sufficiently common in the LXX, as well as in earlier Greck, see exx. in Rost u. Palm, Lex. s. v.
$\mu \alpha \nu ञ \alpha \nu \in \tau \omega \sigma \alpha \nu]$ 'let them learn.' Who? The $\chi$ ñpa implied in the collec-tively-taken $\chi \eta_{\rho} \rho \alpha$ ? or the т'ккข and éккrova? The former is supported by Vulg., Clarom., Chrys., and Theod.; the latter, however, which has the support of Syr., Theoph, CEcum. 2, al., seems more in accordance both with the context generally, and with the use of the special terms $\in \dot{\nu} \sigma \in \beta \in i \nu$ (sec below) and $\dot{\alpha} \mu o \iota \beta \grave{\alpha} s$ àmoóı . The explanation of

 $\tau \delta$ ỏ $\phi \epsilon i ́ \lambda \eta \mu a$ ठıà $\tau \bar{\omega} \nu \pi a i \delta \omega \nu$, can scarcely be regarded as otherwise than artificial and unsatisfactory. $\quad \pi \rho \bar{\omega} \tau \circ \nu]$ ' first,' scil. 'before thou hast to do it,' De W.

#   

$\epsilon \dot{\nu} \sigma \in \beta \in \hat{i} \nu]$＇to be dutiful，＇＇to evince （ filial）piety towards，＇＇barusnjan，＇Goth． （Massm．）；compare Acts xvii．23，oे à $\gamma$－ vooûvtєs єủ $\sigma \in \beta \in i ̂ \tau \in$（Lachmann，Tisch．）． This verb can harilly be referred to the $\chi$ そ́pal，as it certainly cannot be taken ac－ tively，＇domum suam regere，＇Vulg．， and not very plausibly，＇to practise piety in respect of，＇Matth．；whereas when re－ ferred to the children，its primitive sense is but slightly obscured ；compare Philo， de Dec．Orac．§ 23，Vol．ir．p． 200 （ed． Mang．），where storks are similarly said єú $\sigma \in \beta \in i v$ and rnpotpoфєiv．The expres－ sion ròv $\frac{10}{0}$ to ol̂kov is somewhat singular in such a connection，but the remark of De Wette（who has elucidated the whole passage with great ability）that oiko was expressly used to mark the duty as an act of＇family feeling and family honor，＇ seems fuirly to meet the difficulty．T $\delta \nu$ yotov marks the contrast between assist－ ance rendered by members of the same family and that supplied by the com－ parative strangers composing the local church．$\quad \kappa \alpha l \dot{\alpha} \mu о \iota \beta$ ผेs к．$\tau . \lambda$ ．］ ＇and to requite their parents ；＇further ex－

 ed by Elsner，and Wetst．in loc．（comp．
 $\delta \nu \in i v)$ ，and while perfectly suitable in the case of children，would certainly seem very unusual in reference to parents． The duty itself is enforced in Plato，Legy． 1v． 717 ；see also Stobæus，Floril．Tit． 79，and especially Taylor，Duct．Dub． III．5．3．חióqovot does not commonly． refer to living parents（De W．however， cites Plato，Legg．xi．931），but in the present case suitably balances the term éřova，and seems adopted as briefly comprehending both generations，moth－ ers or grandmothers． тоиิтo $\gamma$ à $\rho$ к．$\tau . \lambda_{\text {．}}$ See notes on ch．ii． 3.

5．ウ́ $\delta$ ह̀ oै $\nu \tau \omega s$ Хभ́pa］＇But（not ＇now＇Auth．Ver．）she that is a widow indeed ；＇sharp and emphatic contrast to the foregoing，serving to specify still more clearly to Timothy the characteris－ tics of the＇widow indeed．＇
$\kappa$ al $\mu \in \mu \circ \nu \omega \mu \epsilon \in \nu$ ］＇and left desolate；＇ explanatory，not merely additional （Schlcierm．）characteristic．Matthies urges that if this were an explanatory characteristic，it would have been either
 does not seem necessary；the apostle probably feeling and remembering the adjectival nature of $\chi \hat{\eta} \rho \alpha$［xA－，perhaps Sanser．hd，＇deserere，＇Pott，Etym．Vol． 1．p． 199 ；but comp．Donalds．Cratyl． § 280，287，and Benfey，Wurzellex．Vol． II．p．188］，adds another epithet which explains，and more exactly marks，the characteristic（orbitas）which is involved in $\chi^{\prime} \dot{\rho} p a$ ，and forms the principal subject of thought．

そ̆ $\lambda \pi \iota \kappa \in \nu \kappa . \tau . \lambda$. ＇hath placed her hopes on God；＇＇hath hoped and still hopes；＇see Winer，Gr．§ 41．4，p．242．On the distinction be－ tween $\dot{\epsilon} \lambda \pi i \zeta \omega$ with $\dot{\epsilon} \pi i$ and accus．and with $\epsilon^{\prime} \pi i$ and dat．see notes on ch．iv． 10. $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \mu \in \mathcal{E} \ell \ell]$＇abides in ；the preposi－ tion apparently intensifying the meaning of the simple verb；see Acts xi．23，$\tau \hat{?}$

 $\pi \rho о \sigma \epsilon \cup \chi \hat{\eta} \pi \rho \sigma \sigma \kappa \alpha \rho \tau \epsilon \rho \in i v$, Acts i．14，Rom． xii．12，Col．iv．2，and consult Rost u． Palm，Lex．s．v．$\pi \rho \dot{\text { ós，C．c，Vol．II．p．}}$ 1162．On the distinction between $\delta$ é $\eta \sigma$ เs and $\pi \rho o \sigma \epsilon u \chi$ ń，see notes on ch．ii．1，and on Eph．vi．18．It may be observed that the article is prefixed to both：it clearly might have been omitted before the latter；St．Paul，however，chooses to regard prayer under two separate aspects ； comp．Winer，Gr．§ 19．5，p． 117 note．




i. e. grammatically considered, within the space of time expressed by the substantives: see Donalds. Gr. § 451, Krüger, Sprachl. § 47. 2, and comp. notes on ch. ii. 6 ad fin. St. Luke, in the very parallel case of Anna, ch. ii. 37, uses the acc. עט́кта каi $\eta \mu \epsilon \epsilon^{\prime} \rho \nu$, but there the previous occurrence of $\nu \eta \sigma \tau$ ciass renders the accusative and perhaps the order (fasts appy. began at eve, Winer, 1 'WB. Art. 'Fasten,' compare Lev. xxiii. 32) perfectly appropriate; in Acts xxvi. 7 and in 2 Thess. iii. 8 (Tisch:) the accus. is appy. lyperbolical. On the order עикто̀s ка. $\dot{\eta} \mu$. (always in St. Paul), comp. Lobeck, Paralip. p. 62 sq. It may be observed that St. Luke adopts the order $\nu$ икт. каi $\dot{\eta} \mu$. with the acc. (cornp. Mark iv. 27), and inverts it when he uses the gen. (opp. to Mark v. 5). St. John (Rev. iv. 8, vii. 15 , xii. 10 , xiv. $11, \mathrm{xx} .10$ ) uses only the gen. and the order $\dot{\eta \mu}$. каl $\nu v \kappa \tau$ ós. Is the order clicays to be explained from internal considerations, and not rather to be referred to the habit of the writer?
6. $\hat{\eta} \delta$ हे $\sigma \pi \alpha \tau \alpha \lambda \hat{\omega} \sigma \alpha]$ 'but she that liveth riotously ; ' one of the sins of Sodom and her daughters (Ezek. xvi. 49), forming a sharp contrast to the life of self-
 raגây only occurs again in the N. Test., James v. 5, Є̇трифйбатє кul Є่ $\sigma \pi a \tau \alpha \lambda \eta$ ท-
 $\tau \alpha ́ \lambda \omega \nu$, Eeclus. xxi. 15, $\delta \sigma \pi \alpha \tau \alpha \lambda \omega ิ \nu$. As the derivation of each word suggests, $\sigma \pi a \tau \alpha \lambda \alpha \dot{\omega}$ [ $\Sigma \Pi A-$, cognate with $\sigma \pi \alpha \hat{\alpha} \alpha \omega$ ] points more to the 'prodigality' and 'ucastefulness' (Benfey, Wurzellex. Vol. 1. p. 592) ; the somerwhat synonymous word трифવ́ळ ( $\uparrow \rho \frac{1}{\pi} \tau \tau \bar{\omega}$ ), more to the ' effeminacy' and 'luxury' of the subject: so also rightly Tittmann, Synon. I. p. 193. The present verb is thus, etymologically considered, more allied in mean-
ing to dं $\sigma \omega \dot{\sigma} \omega \boldsymbol{\omega}$ § $\eta \nu$, comp. notes on Eph. v. 18 , though it is occasionally found (Theano, ad Eubul. p. 86, ed. Gale, rג̀ $\sigma \pi \alpha \tau a \lambda \omega \hat{\omega} \tau \alpha$ $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \alpha \iota \delta i(\omega \nu)$ in a sense scarcely at all differing from трuфâv. See also Suicer, Thesuur. s. v. Vol. 11. p. 992.
$\zeta \omega \bar{\sigma} \alpha \tau \epsilon \in \nu \eta \kappa \in \nu]$ 'is dead while she liveth;' so Rev. iii. I, Sท̄s, кal vekpos єî, compare Eph. iv. 18. The meaning is rightly expressed by the Greek expositors, e. g. Theophyl. (most incorrectly quoted by Huther), каे $\nu$ бок $\hat{\eta}$

 larly Theodoret, but with less theological accuracy of expression. Her life is merely a conjunction of soul and body, destitute of all union with the higher and truly quickening principle; comp. Olshausen, Opusc. p. 196. Numerous quotations involving similar sentiments will bo found in Wetst. in loc.; the most pertinent is Plilo, de Profug. § 10, Vol. I. p.

 ner, Obs, p. 404.
7. $\tau \alpha \hat{v} \tau \alpha]$ 'these things:' what things? Those contained $(a)$ in ver. 3 -6 ouly, Theodoret (appy.), and $\mathrm{Hu}-$ ther ; or (b) in ver 6 only, Chrys. ; or (c) in ver. 5 and 6, De Wette and Wiosing. Of these $(a)$ is very plausible on account of the simple mandatory force of $\pi a \rho \alpha ́ \gamma \gamma \in \lambda \lambda \epsilon$, but involves the difficulty that $\dot{a} \nu \in \pi i \lambda$. must then be referred to $\tau \in ́ \kappa \nu \alpha$ and ধ́күоva as well as the widows, whereas the latter seem manifestly the principal subjects. The use of nal (not simply $\tau \alpha \hat{v} \tau \alpha$ as in ch. iv. 6) is in favor of (b), but then again it seems impussible to disunite two verses so closely connectcd by the antithesis involved as ver. 5 and 6. On the whole, then, it seems best to adopt (c), and to refer the pro*

#   

 good character ; refuse younger widows, whom I desire rather to marry, and not to give offence.
noun to the two foregoing verses: ка. thus binds ver. 7 to ver. 5 and 6, while ver. 8 includes the whole subject by a still more emphatic statement of the rule involved in ver. 4 , but not then further expanded, as the statement of the different classes and positions of the widows would otherwise have been interrupted. $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \gamma \gamma \in \lambda \lambda \epsilon]$ 'command;' see notes on ch. iv. 11 : the choice of this stronger word seems to imply that the foregoing contrast and distinction between $\dot{\eta}$ üvtws $\chi$ ŋ́pa and $\dot{\eta} \sigma \pi a \tau$. was intended to form the basis for a rule to the church.
 widows, not the widows and their descendants, see above. On the meaning of the word, see notes on ch. iii. 2.
8. $\epsilon i$ § $\begin{gathered}\text { e. } \\ \text { r. } \lambda \text {.] Recurrence to the }\end{gathered}$ same subject and to the same persons, тє́кขа каіे є̈күора, as in ver. 4, but, as the ris implies, in the form of a more general statement. The $\delta \frac{1}{\epsilon}$ (not $=\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$, as Syr.) is correctly used, as the subjects of this verse stand in a sort of contrast to the widows, the subjects of ver: 7.
$\tau \bar{\omega} \nu i \delta i \omega \nu \kappa \cdot \tau . \lambda$.$] 'his own (relatives)$ and especially those of his oun house;' Yotot here marks the relationship, оiкєiob, those who were not only relations, but also formed part of the family,一тò̀s ка-
 ray; 'domestici, qualis vel maxime est mater aut avia vidua, domi,' Bengel. Lachmann, on fair uncial authority $\mathrm{AD}^{1}$ FG], omits the second $\tau \hat{\omega}$; this would bind the rôto and oikeiot more explicitly into one class; Winer, Gr. § 19 4, p. 116. On оiккîot, comp. notes on Gal. vi. 10. It is worthy of notice that the Essenes were not permitted to give relief to their relatives without leave from their
'̇mít $о$ oroı, though they might freely do so to others in need; see Joseph. Bell. Jud. II. 8. 6.
 not provide for;' only again Rom, xii. 17 (from Prov. iii. 4) and 2 Cor. viii. 21 ; in both cases with an accus. rei (Jelf, Gr. $\S 496$, obs. 1 ), in the former passage in the middle, in the latter (Lachm.) in the active voice. On the connection $\epsilon i$ ou (here perfectly intelligible as ov is in such close connection with $\pi \rho 0 \nu 0 \in \hat{\imath}$ ), see the copious list of examples in Gayler, Partic. Neg. pp.99-115, and notes on ch. iii. 5. $\quad \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \pi i \sigma \tau \iota \nu \breve{h} \rho \nu \eta \tau \alpha \iota]$ 'he hath denied the faith;' not 'doctrinam Christianam,' but 'the (Christian) faith,' considered as a rule of life ; compare notes on Gal. i. 23. His acts are a practical denial of his faith : faith and love are inseparable; in not showing the one he has practically shown that he is not under the infiuence of the other. On the meaning of $\pi i \sigma \tau t s$, see Reuss, Theol. Chrét. Iv. 13, Vol. II. p 128 sq.
a $\pi$ [ $\sigma \tau 0 v]$ Not a 'misbeliever' (2 Cor. iv. 4, Tit. i. 15), but an 'unbeliever,' opp. to $\delta \pi i \sigma \tau \epsilon \hat{v} \omega \nu, 1$ Cor. xir. 22 sq. Such a one, though he might bear the name of Christian, would be really worse than a heathen, for the precepts of all better heathenism forbade such an unnatural selfishness ; see Pfanner, Theol. Gent. xr. 22, p. 320, and compare the quotations in Stobæus, Floril. Tit. 79.
9. $\chi \dot{\eta} \rho \alpha \kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \lambda \in \gamma^{\prime} \sigma$ ヘิ $\omega$ к.т. $\lambda$.] 'As widow let no one be put on the list,' etc." In this doubtful passage it will be best to consider ( $a$ ) the simple meaning and grammatical structure ; (b) the interpretation of the clause. First, then, кaтa$\lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon เ \nu$ (кататátтєเv, Suid.) simply means 'to enter upon a list' (see cxamples in

коעta $\gamma \in y o \nu v i ̂ a, ~ e ́ v o ̀ s ~ a ̉ \nu \delta p o ̀ s ~ \gamma v i \eta ́, ~$

Rost u. Palm, Lex. s. v. Vol. r. p. 1624), the contents and object of which must be deduced from the context. Next, we must observe that $\chi$ nipa is in fact the predicate 'als Witwe werde verzeichnet,' Winer, Gr. § 64. 4, p. 521. Grammar and Lexicography help us no further. (b) Interpretation: three explanations have been advanced; ( $\alpha$ ) the somewhat obvious one that the subject of the prereding clause is simply continued; so Chrys. in loc., the other Greek expositors and the bulk of modern expositors. The objections to this are, grammatically considered. the apparently studied absence of any connecting particle; exegetically considered, the high improbability that when criteria had been given, ver. 4 sq ., fresh should be added, and those of so very exclusive a nature; would the Church thus limit her alms? ( $\beta$ ) That of Schleiermacher, Mack, and others, that deaconesses are referred to: against this the obiection usually urged seems decisive,that we have no evidence whatever that deaconesses and $\chi$ йpaь are synonymous terms (the passage in Ignat. Trull. 13, cannot here fairly be made use of, first on account of the doubtful reading; secondly, the suspicion which now hangs about the whole epistle, see Cureton, Corp. Ign. p. 333), and that the age of 60 , though deriving a specious support fiom Cod. Theod. xvi. 2. 27 (compare, however, Conc. Chalc. c. 15, where the age is fixed at 40), is wholly incompatible with the active duties (comp. Bingham, Antiq. II. 22. 8 sq.) of such an office: $(\gamma)$ The suggestion of Grot., ably expanded by Mosheim, and followed by De Wette, Wiesing., Huth. (Einleit. § 4), that an order of widows ( $\chi \eta \rho \hat{\omega} \nu \chi^{\delta}$ bos, Chrrsost. Hom. in Div. N. T. Loc. 31, compare Tertull. de Vel. Virg. 9, and the other reff. in Mosheim) is here referred to, whose duties apparently consisted in
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the exercise of superintendence over, and the ministry of counsel and consolation (see Tertull. l.c.) to, the younger women; whose office in fact was, so to say, presbyteral ( $\pi \rho \in \sigma \beta \dot{v} \tau \iota \delta \in s$ ) rather than diaconic. The external evidence for the existence (though not necessarily the spccial ecclesiastical organization) of such a body even in the earliest times is so fully satisfactory, and so completely in harmony with the internal evidence supplied by ver. 10 sq ., that on the whole $(\gamma)$ may be adopted with some confidence; see the long note of Wiesinger in loc., and Huther, Einleit. § 4, p. $46 . \quad$ We thus find noticed in this chapter the $\chi^{\prime} \eta \mathrm{pa}$ in the ordinary sense; $\dot{\eta}$ ơv $\omega$ 的 $\chi$., the desolate and destitute widow; $\dot{\eta}$ катєь$\lambda \in \gamma \mu \in \dot{\prime} \nu \eta \chi^{\eta} p a$, the ecclesiastical or presbyteral widow. $\gamma \in \gamma$ ovvia is now properly referred by Lachm., Tisch., al., to $\mu \grave{\jmath}$ È $\lambda a \tau \tau o \nu$ к. $\tau . \lambda$., see examples in Raphel, Annot. Vol. If. p. 592. The
 would be perhaps more correct, but the somewhat concise gen. is perfectly intelligible.
$\dot{\epsilon} \nu \delta s \dot{\alpha} \nu \delta \rho \delta s \gamma \nu \nu \dot{\eta}]$ 'the wife of one husband:' comp. ch. iii. 2. It is obvious that this can only be contrasted with successive polygamy, and cannot possibly be strained to refer to the legitimacy of the marriage (compare Beng.). In plain terms the woman was to be univira: so Tertull. ad Uxor. 1. 7 , 'præscriptio Apostoli ..... viduam allegi in ordinem [ordinationem, Seml.] nisi univiram non concedit;' compare notes on ch. iii. 2 , and the copious list of exx. in Wetst. in loc.
 'well-reported of in the matter of good works,' scil. 'for good works ;' compare notes on Titus iii. 8 'E $\nu$ denotes the sphere to which the woman's actions and the consequent testimony about them was confined. Huther cites Heb. xi. 2



 (Ecum. (Griesb., Scholz, De W. e sil., Wordsw.). Lachm., Tisch., Alf, here read катабт pquiáбovaw with $\mathrm{AFG} ; 31$; Chrys. (Cod.). Though the future might tairly be bome with, as in Rev. iv. 9 (comp. pres. Mark xi. 25), the external authority does not seem sufficient, for it must be remembered that $F$ and $G$, even in errors of tramscription (' mira est utriusque [codicis] consensio in lectionibus ipsisque multis culdumi erroribus,' Tisch.), are practically little more than one authority. Moreover, the only correct principle of explaining these usages of $\overrightarrow{\text { ead }} \nu$ and $\delta \tau a \nu$ with the imdic., - viz., the restriction of the whole conditional force to the particle, and the absence of necessary internal connection between the verb in the protasis and that in the apodosis - does not seem here to apply. St. Paul does not apparently desire to mark the mere relation of time, but the ethical connection between kataotp. and $\gamma a \mu$. งé $\lambda$. : a weariness of Christ's yoke involves a further and more decided lapse.

as evincing the use of $\bar{\epsilon} \nu$ to mark the reason of the $\mu$ aptipia, but there $\epsilon^{2} \nu$ is simply 'in;' in hâc ficle constituti,' Winer, Gir. § 48. a, p. 346, note. Maptupeiovar appears frequently used in the N. T., e. g. Acts vi. 3, x. 22, xvi. 2 al., in special reference to a good testimony. The simple meaning is retained by Syr., Vulg., Goth., al. $\in i$ $\dot{\epsilon} \tau \in \mathbb{\nu} \nu \circ \tau \rho \delta \phi \eta \sigma \in \nu$ ] 'if she (ever) lrought up children;' hypothetical clause, ultimately dependent on $\kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \lambda$., but still also more immediately explanatory of ${ }_{\epsilon} \rho \gamma$. кал. It is doubtful whether тєкעотpoфeiv is to be confined to the widow's own children (Vulg., Chris. and Greek commeutt ), or extended also to the orplans she might have brought up, 'ecclesiæ commodo' (Beng.). The latter scems most probable, especially as in two passagres which have been adduced, Hermann Past. Mund. 1. 2, and Lucian, de Mort. Peregr. § 12, widows and orphans are mientioned in a suggestive connection.
 od.) is necessarily implied, though not cxpressed in the word.
$\epsilon \xi \xi \in \nu 0 \delta \delta \chi \eta \sigma \in \nu]$ ' entertained strangers;'
ä́r. $\lambda \in \gamma o ́ \mu$., but comp. Matth. xxv. 35. The sequence of duties may have been suggested by the relations of proximity;
 $\gamma \in \sigma i ́ a s ~ \tau \omega ิ \nu$ à $\lambda \lambda о \tau \rho i ́ \omega \nu$ т $\rho o \tau i ̂ ̀ \eta \sigma \iota$, Chrys.; the widow's own children would clearly be comprehended in, and even form the first objects of the $\tau \epsilon \kappa \nu 0 \tau \rho \circ ф i ́ a$.
ti á yic $\omega$ к. $\tau . \lambda$.] 'if she (ever) washed the feet of the suints ;' an act not only connected with the rites of Oriental hospitality (Jahn, Archreol. § 149), but demonstrative of her humility (1 Sam. xxv. 41 ,-it was commonly a servant's office, Elsner, Ohs. Vol. I. p. 338), her love (compare Luke vii. 38), and, it might be added, the practical heartiness (comp. Chrysostom) of her hospitality : 'non dedignetur quod fecit Christus facere Christianus,' August. in Joan. Tract. Lviil. $\quad$ є่ $\pi \dot{\eta} \rho \kappa \in \sigma \in \nu$ ] 'relieved;' ' $\beta \circ$ ŋ́ $\uparrow \eta \sigma \in \nu$, Hesych., compare Polyb. Hist. 1. 51. 10, where it is used as nearly synonymous with $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \beta \circ \eta \imath \uparrow \in i v$. It thas need not be restricted merely to alms (àmорía è̉таркеĩv, Clem. Alex. Strom. 1. 10, compare Vales. on Euseb. Hist. vil. 5), nor $\uparrow \lambda \iota \beta o \mu$. to ' paupertate pres-

sis＇（Beng．），but，as apparently Syriac AToj］［refocillavit］，may refer to the relief of necessity in its most general
 $\sigma$ tas，кal $\mu \epsilon \sigma \iota \tau \epsilon(a s$, Theophyl．
$\dot{\epsilon} \pi \eta \kappa о \lambda о \cup ์ N \eta \pi \in \nu$ ］＇followed after；＇ comp． 1 Pet．ii．21，е̇maxo入ovìєiv тuîs ＇$\chi \nu \in \sigma t \nu$ ：the $\bar{\varepsilon} \pi$ l does not appear to in－ volve any idea of intensity，scil．$\pi \rho \circ$（os $\boldsymbol{\mu} \omega \mathbf{s}$ ${ }_{\text {кal }} \mathrm{ka} \mathrm{\tau}$＇$Y \chi \nu \eta$ ，Coray，Auth．Ver．（comp． Steph．in Thesaur．s．v．），but only that of direction．The sense is not very differ－
 1 Thess．v． 15 ；compare Plato，de Rep．
 शeiv，where the next words，$\mu \grave{\eta}$ è $\nu \pi \alpha \rho \hat{\rho} \rho$－ yov $\mu$＇ि $\rho \epsilon$ ，supply the notion of $\pi \rho о \imath v \mu\{a ;$ see ib．Phuedo，p． 107 в，where the force of the compound also does not seem very strongly marked．The meaning is rightly conveyed by Chrys．，$\delta \eta \lambda o u ̂ \nu \tau o ́ s ~ द ̀ \sigma \tau \iota v, ~ o ̈ \tau \iota ~$


11．$\nu \in \omega \tau$ द́f $\rho a s]$ Not necessarily，with studied reference to ver． 9 ，＇widows un－ der sixty years of age，＇Wiesing．，but， as the context seems to imply，＇younger＇ with nearly a positive sense，ver． 2 ．
$\pi a \rho a i t o \hat{v}]$＇shun，＇or，as the contrast
 quire，－＇decline＇（＇refuse，＇Auth．Ver．， $\dot{\alpha} \pi \delta \beta \alpha \lambda \lambda \epsilon$ ，Coray，）scil．＇to put on the katd́doyos of the presbyteral widows．＇ They were not necessarily to be excluded from the alms of the Church（＇Taylor， Episc．§ 14），but were only to be held in－ eligible for the＇collegium viduarum ；＇ compare however ver．16．On пapaitov̂， compare notes on ch．iv． 7 ：the regular meaning（as Huther properly observes） suggested by ch．iv．7， 2 Tim．ii．23，Tit． iii．10，need not here be lost sight of； Timothy was to shun them，and not en－ tertain their claims ；＇noli causem earum suscipere，＇Beng．
zт $\alpha \nu \kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \sigma \tau \rho \eta \nu$ ．］＇when they have come to wax wanton against Christ，＇Auth． Vers．，＇lascivieru［i］nt，＇Beza；the aor． subj．with ä avav，marking an action which takes place at some single point of time distinct from the actual present，but oth－ erwise undefined；see Winer，Gr．$\$ 42$. 5，p．275，and notes on 2 Thess．i． 10. This translation of kata⿱一兀⿻儿口一大p．may be fully retained if＇lascivire＇be taken more in its simple（＇instar juventorum quæ cum pabulo ferociunt，＇Scul．ap．Pol．Syn．） than in its merely sexual reference（quæ fornicato sunt in injuriam Christi，Je－ rome，Epist．11，al．223），though this， owing to the $\gamma$ aueiv vínovotv，not simply
 wholly be put out of sight．$\Sigma_{\text {Tp }}$ nuda，a word of later comedy（see Lobeck，Phryn． p． 381 ），implies the exhibition of＇over＿ strength，＇＇restiveness，＇and thence of fulness of bread＇（Antiph．ap．Athen． 1ir．127），and＇wanton luxury ；＇comp． Rev．xviii．7，9．The adjective $\sigma \tau \rho \eta \nu$ خे）s is far more probably connected with the Sabine＇strena＇（Donalds，Varron．1v． 2），and the Lat．＇strenuus＇（Pott，Elym． Vol．I．p．198）than with тopós，tpavós， which is suggested by Lobeck．The prep．катà expresses the direction of the aetion（Rost u．Palm，Lex．s．v．kard，iv． 2），and points to the object against which the $\sigma \tau \rho \hat{\eta} v o s$ was shown ：comp．кatakav－ $\chi \bar{\alpha} \sigma \hat{\imath} a t$, James ii． 13.
 ing about with them a judgment that，＇etc．； comp．$\phi \dot{\beta} \beta$ ov モ̌ $\chi \in \iota \nu$ ，verse 20 ，áuapriav モ̌ $\chi \in L \nu$, John xv．22．The judgment or sentence is a load which they bear about with them（comp．Gal．v．10）；and this judgment is that $\grave{\eta}$＇éctクoav к．$\tau$ ．$\lambda$ ．＂OTı is thus not causal，but objective，and so must not，as in Mill，be preceded by a comma，－a punctuation probably sug－ gested by a misinterpretation of крîua． This it need searcely be said is not for

## 

ката́крєца ('damnationem,' Vulg., Clarom. ; ката́крเбıv, Theophyl.), much less $=$ 'punishment' (beladen sich mit Strafbarkeit,' Mack), but retains its usual and proper meaning. The context will alone decide the nature of the judgment, whether favorable or unfavorable; comp. notes on Gal v. 10, and Fritz. Rom. Vol. I. p. 94.
$\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \pi \rho \dot{\omega} \tau \eta \nu$ к. $\tau . \lambda$. ' they broke their first faith;' clearly, as it is explained by the Greek commentt., their engagement ( $\sigma v \nu \uparrow \uparrow \uparrow \kappa \eta \nu$, Chrys.) to Christ not to marry again, which they virtually, if not explicitly, made when they attempted to undertake the duties
 quyaîces; so Theodoret, $\tau \hat{\psi} \mathrm{X} \rho เ \sigma \tau \hat{\psi} \sigma \nu \nu$ -
 puts ómi入oû̃t ráuoss. The only seeming difficulty is $\pi \rho \omega \dot{\tau} \eta \nu$, not $\pi \rho o \tau \epsilon \rho \rho a \nu$, as the $\pi \rho \omega \dot{\tau} \eta$ mí $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ ts was really to the first husband. This is easily explained : there are now only two things put in evidence, faith to Christ and faith to some second husband. In comparing these two, the superlative, according to a very common Greek habit of speaking, is put rather than the comparative ; see Winer, G'r. § 35. 4. 1, p. 218. The phrase $\dot{\alpha} \hat{\imath} \in \tau \in i v$ ríativ, ' fidem irritam facere,' is illustrated by Wetstein and esp. Raphel in loc.; the latter cites Polyb. Hist.viII. 2. 5, xi. 29. 3, xxiry. 16. 5, xxiv. 6. 7. The numerous illustrations that the language of St. Paul's unquestioned Epistles has received from Polybius are well-known and admitted. This persistent similarity, in the case of an Epistle of which the genuineness has been (unreasonably) doubted, is a subsidiary argument which ought not to be lost sight of.
13. $\alpha \not \mu \alpha \alpha$ हो к. $\tau, \lambda$.] There is some difficulty in the construction ; $\mu \alpha \nu \geqslant \alpha^{\prime} \nu$. is usually connected with $\pi \in \rho t \epsilon \rho \chi$., but, unless with De Wette and Wiesinger we plainly assume that the participle is in-
correctly used for the infinitive, we shall have an incongruous sense, for $\mu \alpha \nu$ งáv $\omega$
 that I am going about,' Jelf, Gr. § 683. Again if with Wordsworth we translate 'being idle they are learners, ruuning about' we have an absolute use of $\mu a \nu$ ~ $\alpha$ duc (compare, however, 2 Tim. iii. 7) and a dislocation of words that seem harsh and unnatural. It will be best then, with Syr., Chrysost., al., and also Winer, Gr. § 45. 4, p. 311, to connect $\mu a \nu ה$. with àp ${ }^{2}$ ai, 'they learn to be idle,' especially as this can be supported by Plato, Euthyd. p. 276 B, oi ả $\mu \mathrm{i}$ кiṣ ă pa бофоl $\mu a \nu \geqslant a ́ v o u \sigma t \nu$ [Bekker, however, omits $\sigma 0 \phi \circ$ i], and in part by Dio Chrys.
 $\tau \eta \grave{\nu} \tau 0 \hat{\nu} \pi a \tau \rho \partial े s \tau \in \chi \nu \dot{\eta} \nu$, - both of which examples are appositely cited by Winer, l. c. If it be urged (De Wette, Wiesing.) that running about would be more naturally the consequence of idleness than vice vers $\hat{\alpha}$, it may be said that $\pi \in p l \epsilon \rho \chi$. may possibly refer to some portion of their official duties, in the performance of which, instead of rather acquiring spiritual experiences, they only contract idle and gossiping habits. T às oikias might seem to confirm this, 'the houses of them they have to visit;' but compare 2 Tim. iii. 6, where (as here) the article appears generic, or at most, ' the houses of such as receive them ;' comp. Winer, Gr.§ 17. 1, p. 116, note (ed. 5).
$\left.\pi \in \rho \iota \in \rho \chi \chi^{\delta} \mu \in \nu \propto \iota\right]$ 'going round to ;' the participle is certainly used with reference to an idle, wandering, way of going about, in Acts xix. 13; this meaning, however, is derived from the context, which does not oblige us necessarily to retain the same meaning here. Other examples of accusatives after the $\pi \in \rho\}$ in the comp. verb are found in the N. T., e.g. Mark vi. 6, Acts ix. 3, al. ; compare also Matth. Gr.§ 426, Bernhardy, Synt.
 $\lambda a \lambda o v ̂ \sigma a \iota ~ \tau a ̀ ~ \mu \eta ̀ ~ \delta \epsilon ́ o \nu \tau a . ~ 14 ~ \beta o u ́ \lambda o \mu a \iota ~ o v ̂ \nu ~ \nu \epsilon \omega \tau ' ́ ́ p a s ~ \gamma a \mu \epsilon i ̂ \nu, ~ \tau \epsilon \kappa \nu o-~$
v: 30 ad fin., p. 260.
à入入̀̀каl
 tattlers and busybodies;' द̇ँ $\pi$ àópiे $\omega \sigma$ เs of preceding epithet; beside being merely idle, they also contract and display a ' mala sedulitas' in both words and actions. Ф̀v́apos, an ä́ $\pi$. $\lambda \in \gamma \delta \dot{\mu}$. in N. T. (but see $\phi \lambda v a p \epsilon i ̃, 3$ John 10), as its derivation [Пی๙-, fluere, Pott, Etymol. Forsch. Vol. I. 212] obviously suggests, points to a babbling, profluent way of talking. Mepiepros (see Acts xix. 19) marks a meddling habit, a perverted activity that will not content itself with minding its own concerns, but must busy itself about those of others; compare 2 Thess. iii.
 vous, [Demosth.] Philipp. Iv. 150, Єॄ $\xi$ ©

$\lambda \alpha \lambda_{0} \hat{v} \sigma \alpha t$ к. $\left.\tau . \lambda_{0}\right]$ 'speaking things which they ought not,' carrying things from

 ékeívqע ф'́povat, Theophyl. On $\tau \grave{\alpha} \mu \eta$ סéovta, comp. notes on Tit. i. 11.
14. Bov́лo $\mu \alpha_{l}$ ] 'I desire;' not merely ' I hold it advisable,' De Wette, 'velim,' Beza, comp. notes on ii. 8. The comparison of this verse with verse 11 is instructive ; there the widows them-
 lead them to it (Eph. ii. 3) ; their will is to marry ; here St. Paul desires (deliberato et propenso animo,' Tittm.) that not being on the list - they would do so.

 general rule, the distinction of Tittmann,
 est quam simpliciter velle, neque' in se habet notionem voluntatis propense ad aliquam rem, sed $\beta$ oú $\lambda \in \sigma \hat{N} a l$ denotat ipsam animi propensionem, - will be found satisfactory, but in the application of it to individual cases proper caution must
be used. It ought to be remarked that $\sim^{\top} \lambda \omega$ is by very far more frequently used by St. Paul than $\beta$ oún., the latter occurs only 1 Cor. xii. 11, 2 Cor. i. 15, and 17 (Lachm.) Phil. i. 12, 1 Tim. ii. 8, vi. 9, Tit. iii. 8 , Philem. 13 ; once only 1 Cor. l. c. in ref. to God (the Holy Ghost). Bov́ $\lambda$. is most used by St. Luke in the Acts, where it occurs about fourteen times, and consequently, if we except quotations, rather more frequently than $\uparrow$ స̇ $\lambda \omega$.
$0 \hat{u} \nu$ has here its proper collective force (Klotz, Derar. Vol. II p. 717), 'in consequence of these things being so, I desire,' etc. ; 'igitur,' Beza, - not an injudicious change for ' ergo,' Vulg., as there is here no 'gravior argumentatio ; 'see Hand, Tursell, Vol. III. p. 187.
$\nu \in \omega \tau \epsilon \rho \alpha s$ ] 'younger widows,' not merely 'younger , women,' as Auth. Ver.; still less 'Jungfrauen,' as Bauer. The context seems to confine our attention simply to widows. The true aspect of this precept is, as Wiesinger observes, defined by oủv here, and $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ ver. 15 ; the precept involves its own restrictions. The apostle desires the younger widows to marry rather than attempt a course of duties which they might swerve from or degrade ; compare Chrysost.
$\tau \in \chi \nu \circ \gamma$. оiкoठ.] 'to bear' children, to rule the house ;' regular infin. after verbs denoting 'a motion of the will,' Jelf, $G r . \$ 664$; compare Winer, Gr. § 44: 3, p. 287. Both words are ${ }_{\alpha}^{2} \pi . ~ \lambda \epsilon \gamma \delta \mu$. in the N. T.; the substantive $\tau \epsilon \kappa \nu \circ \gamma o \nu i ́ a$, however, occurs ch. ii. 15, and oikо $\delta \epsilon \sigma$ пóт $\eta$ s several times in the first three gospels. Both the latter substantive and its verb belong to later Greek, oikías $\delta \in \sigma \pi \delta^{\prime}-$
 т $\eta$ s, Phrynicus; so Pollux, Onom. x. 21 : further examples are cited by Lobeck, on Phryn. p. 373. It is an untenable position that тєкขотроф. is included in тєкขо-





रov．（Möller）；if included in any word， it would far more naturally be so in ob－ rudeatoteî（Leo），which points to the woman＇s sphere of domestic dutics．
$\tau \hat{\varphi} \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \iota \kappa \in \iota \mu \epsilon \in \nu \omega]$＇to the adversary；＇ not＇the devil，＇Chrys．，for though this application derives some plausibility from тои̂ इat．ver． 15 ，yet the $\lambda o i \delta o \rho$ ．$\chi$ 人́pıv scems far more naturally to suggest a reference to human opponents，－the ad－ versaries of Christianity（Phil．i．28，Tit． ii．8）among the Jews or the Gentiles ； so Hammond，De．W．，Wiesinger．On this word，and the possibly stronger $\dot{\alpha} \nu \tau t-$ $\tau \pi \sigma \sigma \delta ́ \mu \in \nu 0 \iota$（＇qui in adversâ acie stantes oppugnant＇），see Tittm．Synon．II．p． 11．入ot $\begin{aligned} & \text { opías } \chi \alpha ́ \rho \iota \nu] ~\end{aligned}$ ＇for reviliny，＇lit．＇to further，promote， reviling；＇prepositional clause，append－ ed to $\dot{\alpha} \phi o \rho \mu \eta ̀ \nu \nu \delta \delta \delta o v a l$ to specify the man－ ner in which，and purpose for which，the occasion would be used ；on the meaning of $\chi$ d́pıv compare notes on Gul．iii．19， and Donalds．Crutyl．§ 278．The＇re－ proach＇must be understood as directed not merely against the widows，but against Christianity generally ；compare Tit．ii． 5.

15．グ $\delta \eta \gamma \alpha{ }^{\prime} \rho \tau \iota \nu \in s$ ］＇For already
 бía $\gamma \in \gamma \epsilon \in \nu \eta \tau \alpha 1$ ，Theod．Matthies here gives the pronoun a more extended ref－ erence，but without sufficient reason； $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ clearly confirms the command in the preceding verse，and thus naturally refers us to the special cases of those mention－ ed in it． rán teves now adonted by Tisch（ 7 ） with AFG；al．，appears of less critical authority than the reading in the text． $\dot{\epsilon} \xi \in \tau \rho \alpha \pi \eta \sigma \alpha \nu]$＇（have）turned them－ selves out of the way，＇sc．of chastity，pro－ priety，and discretion：comp． 2 Tim．iv．

4．It is unnecessary to give this aberra－ tion a wider or more general reference，－ ＇from the faith＇（Mosh．），＇from right teaching＇（Heydenr．）．The younger widows，to whom the apostle alludes， had swerved from the path of purity and chastity，which leads to Christ，and fol－ lowed that of sensuality，which leads to Satan ：Christ was the true spouse，Satan the seducer．
16．$\epsilon$ Y тเs $[\pi \iota \sigma \tau \delta S \ddot{\eta}] \kappa$ ．т．$\lambda$.$] ＇If$ any［believing man or］believing woman have widows，let such relieve them．＇This might fairly seem a concluding reitera－ tion of the precept in ver． 4 and ver． 8 ， or a species of supplementary command based on the same principles（compare Mosh．）．The connection，however，and difference of terms，е̇ँаркєitc not $\pi \rho o-$ vocíco，suggest a different application of the precept．In verses 4,8 ，the duties of children or grandchildren to the elder widow are defined ：here the reference is rather to the younger widows．How were such to be supported？If they married， the question was at once answered；if they remained unmarried，let their rela－ tives，fathers or mothers，uncles or aunts， brothers or sisters，support them，and not obtrude them on the $\chi \eta \rho \iota \kappa \dot{\partial} \nu \tau \dot{\alpha} \gamma \mu a$ ，ver． 9 ，when they might be unfit for the du－ ties of the office，and bring scandal on the church by their defection．
$\beta \alpha \rho \in[\sigma \approx \omega]$＇be burdened，＇Luke xxi． 34,2 Cor．i． 8, v． 4 ；later and less cor－ rect form for $\beta a \rho u ́ v e t \nu$ ．The assertion of Thom．M．s．v．$\pi \lambda \eta ̀ \nu \quad$＇̇ $\pi l$ toû таракєє $\mu$ é－
 $\rho \eta \kappa \alpha$ ，is somewhat doubtful；$\beta \in \beta a \rho \eta \omega$ s （intrans．）is used by Homer，and $\beta \in \beta a p \eta-$ uévos certainly appears in Plato，Symp． p． 203 b，as well as in Aristides（cited by Thom．M．），but the latter passage is
I.et the elders who rule well receive double honor ; he thou guarded in receiv-

 ing accusations against them. Rebuke sinners.
16. $\pi เ \sigma \tau \partial s$ ̂̀ $\pi เ \sigma \tau$ í] So Tisch. (ed. 2, 7) with DKL; nearly all mss.; Vuls. (Tol., Harl. ${ }^{2}$ ), Syr. (both), Ar., Slav.; Clurys. (distinctiy), Theodoret, Dan., al. ( (riest., De IV., Wiesing.), and possibly rightly. The shorter reading єì tas mıotท́n, supported by ACEG; 17.47; Vulg. (Amit., Harl.'), Copt., Arm., and adopted lyy Lachm., deserves much consideration, but can be accounted for more easily than the longer reading. It must now however be added that the newly-discovered s is salid to support the shorter reading' ; see Tischendorf, Notitiu Cod. Simuit. p. 20. If this be correct, and the MS. prove to be of the value and antiquity at present ascribed to it, the preponderance will probably be rightly deemed in favor of the reading of Lachmann.
an imitation of Homer, and the former has a very poetical cast ; the use of $\beta \in-$ Báp $\quad$ uat as the regular Attic perfect (Huther), cannot therefore be completely substantiated: comp. Buttm. Irreg. Verbs, s. v. Bapúva.
17. oi $\kappa \alpha \lambda \hat{\omega} S \pi \rho o \in \sigma \tau \hat{\omega} \tau \in S$ ] 'who rule, preside (surely not 'have presided,' Alf.), well;' not in antithesis to those 'who preside ill,' but in contra-distinction to other presbyters, to the presbyter as such (Wiesing.). The meaning of кал $\omega$ s $\pi \rho о є \sigma \tau \alpha{ }^{\nu} \nu$ a is approximately given
 $\nu \omega \nu \kappa \eta \delta \epsilon \mu$ оуías ${ }^{\prime \prime} \nu \epsilon \kappa \in \nu$; this, however, too much obscures the idea of rule and directive functions (Bloomf.) implied in the participle $\pi \rho o \in \sigma \tau$. ; comp. ch. iii. 4.
$\delta \iota \pi \lambda \hat{\eta} s \tau \iota \mu \hat{\eta} s]$ 'double honor, i.e. remuneration ;' double, not in comparison with that of widows or deacons (Chrys. 1, comp. Thorndike, Relig. Assembl, Iv. 22), nor even of oi $\mu \grave{\eta} \kappa \alpha{ }^{\lambda} \lambda$. $\pi \rho о \in \sigma \tau$. (compare oi á $\mu \alpha \rho \tau \alpha{ }^{\prime} \nu o \nu \tau e s$, ver. 20) but, with a less definite numerical reference,- $\delta \iota \pi-$ $\lambda \hat{p}_{s}$ (not $\delta เ \pi \lambda a \sigma i a s \tau_{\iota} \mu \hat{\eta} s$, as in Plato, Legg. v. p. 730 D$)$, i. e. $\pi 0 \lambda \lambda \hat{\eta} s \tau_{\mu} \mu \hat{\rho}$, Chrys. 2, $\pi \lambda \in \operatorname{iovos} \tau \iota \mu \hat{\eta} s$, Theodoret. Tiù again, as tí $\alpha$, verse 3 , includes, though it does not precisely express, 'salary, remuncration,' and is well paraphrased by Chrysostom as $刃$ © $\rho a \pi \epsilon$ ía [kai]
 Rom. I. 1. Kypke (Obs. Vol. II. p. 361) cites several instances of a similar use of $\tau \mu \mu$, but in all, it will be observed, the regular meaning of the word is distinetly apparent: compare Wakef. Sylv. Crit. Vol. iv. p. 199.
$\dot{\alpha} \xi เ 0 v \dot{v} \omega \sigma \alpha \nu\rceil$ 'be counted worthy,' Auth. Ver., 'digni habeantur,' Vulg., compare Syr., not merely 'be rewarded,' Hammond. They were đ $\xi$ เol $\delta เ \pi \lambda$ जิs $\tau$ b$\mu \hat{\eta} s$, and were to be accounted as such. oi $\kappa 0 \pi t \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \in s \kappa$. $\tau$. $\lambda$.] ' they who labor in word and doctrine;' no hendyadys, scil. єis тŋ̀ $\nu$ ठit $\delta a \chi \grave{\eta} \nu$ тô̂ $\lambda o ́ \gamma o v ~(C o r a y, ~$ al.), but with full inclusiveness,- ' in the general form of oral discourse (whether monitory, hortatory, or prophetic), and the more special form of teaching;' see Thorndike, Prim. Gov. Ix. 3, Vol. I. p. 42 (A.-C. Libr.) Mosheim (de Reb. ante Const., p. 126 sq.) throws a stress upon кoтtiôvtes, urging that the verb does not imply merely 'Christianos erudire, sed populos veræ religionis nescios ejus cognitione imbuere,' p. 127. We should then have two, if not three classes (compare 1 Thess. v. 12),- the preachers abroad, and rulers and preachers at home, the former of which might be thought worthy of more pay : this is ingenious, but it affixes a peculiar theolog-

## $\lambda о ́ \gamma \varphi$ каì סьסабка入ią． <br> 

ical meaning to котtáw which cannot be fully substantiated；compare ch．iv．10， 1 Cor．iv．12，al．The concluding words，
 imply two kinds of ruling presbyters， those who preached and taught，and those who did not ；and though it has been plausibly urged that the differentia lies in кoтt⿳⿵人一⿲丶丶㇒一七七s，and that the apostle does not so much distinguish between the functions as the execution of them （see esp．Thorndike，Prim．Gov．Ix．7）， it yet seems more natural to suppose the existence in the large community at Eph－ esus of a clerical college of $\pi \rho \rho \in \sigma \tau \omega \bar{\omega} \tau \in$ य $\rho \in \sigma \beta \dot{\beta} \tau \epsilon \rho \circ$（Thorndike，ib．inI．2），some of whom might have the $\chi \chi^{\alpha} \rho / \sigma \mu \alpha$ of reaching more eminently than others； see notes on Eph．iv．11，and Neander， Planting，Vol．I．p． 149 sq．（Bohn）．

18．$\lambda \in \in \notin \iota \gamma \grave{\alpha} \rho$ к．$\tau . \lambda$ ．］The first $\dot{q} u)^{2}$ ation is taken from Deuteron．xxv． 4，and is quoted with a similar applica－ tion in 1 Cor．ix．9．The law in ques－ tion，of which the purport and intention was kindness and consideration for ani－ mals（see Philo，de Human．§ 19，Vol．yr． p．400，ed．Mang．，Joseph．Antiq．Iv． 8. 21），is applied with a kind of＇argu－ mentum a minori＇to the laborers in God＇s service．The precept can hardly be said to be generalized or expanded （see Kling，Stud．u．Krit．1839，p． 834 sq．），so much as reapplied and invested with a typical meaning．And this typi－ cal or allegorical interpretation is neither arbitrary nor of mere Rabbinical origin， but is to be referred to the inspiration of the Holy Spirit under which the apostle gives the literal meaning of the words their fuller and deeper application ；com－ pare notes on Gal．iv． 24.
$\mathrm{B} \circ \hat{\nu} \nu \dot{\alpha} \lambda \circ \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \alpha]$＇an ox while treading out the corn ；＇not＇the ox that treadeth，＇ ctc．，Auth．Ver．，－an inexact translation of the anarthrous participle ；compare

Donalds．Gramm．§ 492．Threshing by means of oxen was（and is）performed in two ways；either the oxen were driven over the circularly arranged heaps，and made to tread them out with the hoof （Hozea x．11，compare Micah iv．13），or they were attached to a heavy threshing－
 27，xli．15，or $\operatorname{arpan~}^{\text {an }}$ ，Judges viii．7， see Bertheau in loc．）which they drew over them，see esp．Winer，$R W B$ ．Art． ＇Dreschen，＇Bochart，Hieroz．Vol．r．p． 310，and the illustrations in Thomson， Land and the Book，Vol．11．p． 314.
There is some little doubt about the or－ der；Lachmann reads oủ $\phi \iota, \beta$ ．à ．with AC；seven mss．；Vulg．，Syr．［incorrectly claimed by Tisch．］，Copt．，Arm．；Chrys．， al．As this might have been a correc－ tion from 1 Cor．l．c．，and as the weight of MS．authority（s being also included） is on the other side，it seems best to re－ tain the order of the text．
 imperatival future，on the various usages of which see notes on Gal．v．14，and Thiersch，de Pentat．III．§ 1I，p． 157. The animals that labored were not to be prevented from onjoying the fruits of their labors（Joseph．Antiq．IV．8．21）， as was the custom．among the heathens in the case of their cattle（comp．Bochart， Hieroz．Vol．1．401），and even（hy means of a $\pi$ avaıќтt ，Poll．Onom．vir．20．）， in the case of their slaves ；see＇Rost u．
 $\kappa \alpha$ n $^{2} \xi$ เos к．$\tau . \lambda$ ．］Proverbial declara－ tion（Stier，Red．Jes．Vol．I．p．400）made use of by our Lord（Luke x．7，compare Matth．x．10），and here repeated by St． Paul to enbance the force of，and explain the application of，the preceding quota－ tion．There is nothing in the connection to justify the assertion that this is a cita－ tion from the N．T．（Theodoret），and thus necessarily to be connected with


 оі лоитоі фо́ßоע єै $\chi \omega \sigma \iota \nu$.
$\lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \in!~ \dot{\eta} \gamma p a \phi \dot{\eta}$, as is contended by Baur and others who deny the genuineness of this Epistle; $\gamma p a ф \dot{n}$, it need scarcely be said, being always applied by St. Paul to the Old Testament ; comp. Wieseler, Chronol. p. 303, and see notes on 2 Tim. ii. 16. Though a similar mode of citation is found elsewhere in the case of two actual passages of scripture (Mark vii. 10, Acts i. 20, compare Heb. i. 10), yet we must remember that this is not a case of two parallel citations, but that the second is only explanatory of the first; the comparison, therefore, fails. Even De W. admits that Baur has only probability in his favor.
19. кат $\alpha \pi \rho \in \sigma \beta \nu \tau \epsilon ́ \rho o v]$ 'Aguinst un elder,' Vulg., Goth. ; not ' an clderly man,' Chrys., Theophyl., CEcum. The context is clearly only about presbyters. кат $\ddagger \gamma \circ \rho$ íap] 'a charge, an accusation;'

 asked (De W.) whether Timothy is not to observe the judicial rule here alluded to (Deut. xvii. 6, xix. 5, comp. Matth. xviii. 16, 2 Cor. xiii. 1) in all cases as merely in the case of an elder. The answer is, that Timothy was not a judge in the sense in which the command contemplated the exercise of that office. He might have been justified in receiving an accusation at the mouth of only one witness ; to prevent, however, the scandals that would thus frequently occur in the church, the apostle specifically directs that an accusation against an elder is only to be received when the evidence is most legally clear and satisfactory.
$\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \tau$ dे $s \in \dot{i} \mu$ 向] 'except it be,' 1 Cor. xiv. 5. xv. 2 ; a pleonastic negation, really compounded of two exceptive formulæ ; compare Thom. M. s. v. $\chi \omega p i s$, and see
the examples cited by Wetst. on 1 Cor. l. c., and by Lobeck, Plryn. p. 459.

दे $\pi$ l $\delta$ vio к. $\tau . \lambda_{\text {.] }}$ ] 'on the authority of [' on the mouth of,' Syr.] two or thire witnesses;' compare Xenoph. Hell. vi. 5. 41, द̇ $\pi^{\prime} \dot{\partial} \lambda\left\{\gamma \omega \nu \mu a \rho \tau \dot{\jmath} \rho \omega \nu,{ }^{-‘}\right.$ paucis adhibitis testibus;' Winer, Gr. § 47. g, p. 335. Huther finds a difficulty in this meaning of $\epsilon \pi l$ with the gen. Surcly nothing can be more simple. As èml with a gen. properly denotes superposition (sce Donaldson. Cratyl. § 173), the кат $\eta \gamma o p i ́ a$ is represented as resting upon the witnesses, depending on them to substantiate it; compare Hammond. The closely allied use, ėmi $\delta \iota \kappa а \sigma \tau \omega ิ \nu, ~ \delta ı к а \sigma \tau \eta-$ piov, etc., in which the presence of the partics (coram) is more brought into prominence (i Cor. vi. 1, 2 Cor. vii. 14), is correctly referred by Kühner (Jelf, Gr. §633) to the same primary meaning. The idea of 'connection or accompaniment,' which Peile (following Matth. Gr. § 584. $\eta$ ) here finds in $\dot{\epsilon} \pi l$, is not sufficiently exact: see further examples in Rost u. Palm, Lex. s. v. ėmi, Vol. 1. p. 1034.
20. т.ovs $\left.\dot{\alpha} \mu \cdot \alpha \rho \tau \alpha \alpha^{\prime} \nu \nu \tau a s\right)$ ' them that sin, sinners ;' apparently not the offending presbyters (Huth., Alf.), as the expression is far too comprehensive to he so limited, but sinners generally, persistentes in peccato' (Pricæus ap. Pol. Syn.),-whether. Presbyters or others. This very constant use of the article with the pres. part. as a kind of equivalent fur the substantive is noticed in Winer, (Fi: § 45.7, p. 316 ; see also notes on Girl. i. 23. $\quad \dot{\varepsilon} \nu \omega ́ \pi$ เov $\pi \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \omega_{b^{\prime}}$ must obviously be joined with $\begin{gathered}\lambda \\ \lambda \\ \gamma \\ \\ \\ \epsilon\end{gathered}$, not with áuapt. (Cajet.). This text is perfectly reconcilable with our Lord's instruction (Matth. xviii. 15), not becauso

I solemnly charge thee be not partial or precipitate : some men's sins are sooner, some later, in being found out ; 'so their good works.



'Christus agit de peccato occulto, Paulus de publico' (Justiniani), but because, first, Timothy is here invested with special ecclesiastical authority (compare Thorndike, Prim. Gov. ch. xini), and secondly, because the present participle (contr. tè̀ ámuapr. Matth. l. c.) directs the thought towards the habitually sinful character of the offender ( $\mathrm{E} \pi \mu \mu$ évovias $\tau \hat{\eta}$ $\dot{\text { ámapr. Theoph.), and his need of an open }}$ rebuke; see notes on Epht. iv. 28.
21. Staнарти́рона九] 'I solemnly charge thee,' 'obtestor,' Beza,-or, with full accuracy, 'obtestando Deum (Dei mentione interpositit) graviter ac serio hortor,' Winer, de Verb. c. Prepp. v. p. 20; similarly used in adjurations, 2 Tim. ii. 14, iv. 1., In 1 Thess. iv. 6, the only other passage in which it occurs in St. Paul's Epp. [Heb. ii. 6], it has more the sense of 'assure, solemnly testify :' compare Acts xx. 21, 23, 24. In this verb (frequently used by St. Luke), the preposition appears primarily to mark the presence or interposition of some form of witness, 'intercessionis (Vermittelung) ad quam omnis testimonii provincia redit, notionem,' Winer, l. c. p. 21. On verbs compounded with $\delta$ iá, see the remarks of Tittmann, Synon. r. p. 223. $\tau 0 \hat{v}$ Oeov̂ к. $\tau . \lambda$.$] God and Christ$ Jesus.' With the present reading this text cannot possibly be classed under Granville Sharpe's rule (Green, Gr. p. 216), and even with the reading of the Rec. (kvp. 'I. X., with D ${ }^{3} \mathrm{KL}$; mss.; Syr., Goth., al. ; Chrys., al.), the reference of the two substantives to one person is in the highest degree doubtful and preearious; the Greek Ff. are here for the most part either silent, or adopt the usual translation ; see notes on Eph. v. 5, Middleton, Art. p. 389 (ed. Rose), Stier on Ephl. Vol. 1. p. 250.
$\epsilon^{\epsilon} \kappa \lambda \in \kappa \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\alpha} \gamma \gamma \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \omega \nu$ ] 'elect angels;' 'he adds 'the elect angels' becatise they in the future judgment shall be present as witnesses with their Lord,' Bp. Bull: comp. Jos. Bell. 11. 16. 4 sub fin. (cited

 тои̂ $\Theta \in o \hat{u}$. There is some little difficulty in deciding on the meaning of the term è $\kappa \lambda \epsilon \kappa \tau о$ í. It surely cannot bo a mere 'epitheton ornans' (Huther; compare Calv., Wiesing.), nor does it seem probable that it refers to those of a higher, as oppused to those of a lower, rank ( Ca thar. ap. Est. : comp. Tobit xii. 15), as all such distinctions are at best uncertain and precarious ; compare notes on Col . i. 17. With such passages as 2 Peter in. 4, Jude 6, before us, it seems impossible to doubt that the 'clect angels' 'are those who kept their first estate (Clirys., Theoph., (Ecum.), and who shall form part of that countless host (Jude 14, Dan. vii. 10) that shall attend the Lord's sccond advent; so Stuart, Angelology, iv. 2 (in Biblioth. Sacra, 1843, p. 103); comparo also Twesten, Angelol. § 3 (translated in Bibl. Sacr. for 1844, p. 782). On the existence and ministry of these Blessed Spirits see the powerful and admirable sermons of Bp. Bull, Engl. Works, p. 194 sq . $\tau \alpha \hat{\nu} \tau \alpha]$ 'these things,' which have just been said (ver. 19, 20) about caution in receiving accusations, and necessary exercise of discipline when $\sin$ is patent; so Theodoret (expressly) and the other Greek expositors. De W. and Wiesing. refer taùra only to ver. 20 , but would not toî̀o have thus been more natural? At any rate it secms clearly unsatisfactory to extend the reference to ver. 17 sq . (Huth. ? al.) : instruction about the exerciso of discipline might suitably be connected with

## 

the weighty adjuration in ver. 21 , but scarcely mere semi-fiscal arrangements. $\chi \omega \rho l s \pi \rho о к \rho\{\mu a \tau 0 s\}$ 'without prejudice, prejudging,' (' faúrdômein,' Gothic) ; 'judicium esse debet non prajudicium,' Beng. In the participial clause that follows the contrary aberration from justice is forbidden, scil. 'inclinatio per
 $\tau \hat{\varphi} \hat{\epsilon} \nu l$ l $\mu$ ́pt $t$, Theophyl. The reading $\pi \rho \delta \sigma \sigma \kappa \eta \sigma \iota \nu$ (Lachm. with ADL.; al. 50 ; Copt. ? Chrys. ?) though deserving some consideration on the principle, ' proclivi lectioni prostat ardua,' can scarcely be forced into yielding any natural sense. Both трокр. and $\pi \rho \delta \sigma \kappa \lambda$. are ${ }_{\alpha}^{\alpha} \pi$. $\lambda \epsilon \gamma \delta \beta$. in the N. T.: the latter occurs also in Clem. Rom. I. 47, 50 ; (compare Polyb. Hist. v. 51.8, vi. 10. 10), and is illustrated by Kirebs, Obs. p. 356 sq.
On the alleged distinction between $\chi \omega$ pis and ă $\nu \in u$ see notes on Eph. ii. 12.
22. $\chi \in \mathfrak{i} \rho a s \tau \alpha \chi \in \operatorname{s} \omega$ к. $\tau . \lambda$.$] 'lay$ hands hastily on no man.' Indisputably the most ancient interpretation of these words is ' the imposition of hands in ordination,' $\pi \epsilon \rho \mathfrak{l} \chi \in \iota \rho о т о \nu เ \omega ̄ \nu$, Chrys. ; so Theod., Theophyl., CEcum., and of modern expositors Alford and Wordsworth, but without success in explaining the context. The preceding warnings, however, and still more the decided language of the following clause (comp. $\dot{\alpha} \mu \alpha \rho \tau \alpha \dot{\nu} о \nu \tau \alpha s$ ver. 20) appear to point so very clearly to some disciplinary functions, that it seems best with Hammond (so also De Wette, Wiesing.) to refer these words to the $\chi \in เ \rho o s \epsilon \sigma i a$ on the absolution of penitents, and their re-admission to churchfellowship; so apparently Taylor, Dissuasive, Part. II. 1. 11, though otherwise in Episcopacy, § 14. The prevalency in the apostolic age of the custom of imposition of hands generally, and the distinct evidence of this specific application . of the custom in very early times (Euse-
bius, Hist. vir. 2, calls it a $\pi a \lambda \alpha \iota \partial \nu ~ \tilde{\eta}\{o s ;$ see Concil. Nic. Can. 8), seem to render such an assumption in the present case by no means arbitrary or indemonstrable: see especially Hammond in loc. and compare Suicer, Thesaur. Vot. 11. p. 1516, Bingham, Antiq. xviII. 2. 1. $\mu \eta \delta$ '̀ $\kappa 0 เ \nu \omega \dot{\nu} \in t \kappa$. $\tau$. $\lambda$.] 'nor yet share in the sins of others,' i. e. $\mu \eta \delta \in \in \nu$ боt кal
 § 30.8, p. 180 ; 'do not share with them their sins, by restoring them to churchfellowship on a doubtful or imperfect repentance.' The Auth. Vers. 'be partaker of' 'mache dich theilhaftig,' De Wette) is scarcely sufficiently exact, as this would rather imply a gen. Kouvo$\nu$ eiv is commonly used in the N. T. with a 'dativus rei' (see notes on Gal. vi. 6), and in this construction seems to involve more the idea of community than of simple participation ; see Winer, l. c., Poppo on Thucyd. 11. 16, Vol. 111. 2, p. 77, and comp. notes on Eph. v. 11. On the continued negation $\mu \eta$ - $\mu \eta \delta \epsilon$, see notes on Eph. iv. 27, and the treatise of Franke, de Part. Neg. II. 2, p. 6. The remark of De Wette on this clause seems reasonable, that if the reference were to ordination, this sequence to the command would imply a greater corruption in the Church than is at all credible. To admit that á $\mu \alpha \rho \tau i \alpha u s$ points to á $\mu \alpha \rho \tau \alpha{ }^{\prime} \nu o \nu \tau a s$, and yet to conceive that presbyters are referred to in the latter expression and candidates for ordination in the former (Alford, Wordsw.) is a narrow and somewhat cheerless view of a church which, with all its faults, could not bear 'them which were evil' and knew how to reject false apostles (Rev. ii. 2).
$\sigma \in \alpha u \tau \delta \nu$ к. $\tau . \lambda$.] 'Keep thyself (emphatic) pure:' 'purum,' Beza, not 'castum,' Vulg., Clarom. The position of the reflexive pronoun and the sort of antithesis in which it stands to $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \dot{\partial} \rho$.



seem to imply，＇while thou hast to act as judge upon other men，be morally pure thyself．＇＇A $\gamma \nu o ́ s$（ă $\langle\omega$ ），as its termi－ nation suggests（＇object conceived under certain relations，＇Donalds．Crutyl．§ 255）， implies properly an outward，and thence an inward，purity；＇á $\gamma \nu \grave{\nu} \nu$ est in quo nihil est impuri，＇Tittmann，Synon．r．p． 22 ；compare á $\gamma \nu \grave{\eta}$ à $\nu \alpha a \tau \rho \circ ф \dot{\eta}, 1$ Pet．iii． 2，бoфía á $\gamma v \eta ̀$ ，James iii．17．The deriv－ ative sense of＇castitas＇（＇purtas a ve－ nere，＇áyvòs $\gamma a \mu \omega ิ \nu$ ，Eur．Phœen．953） comes easily and intelligibly from the primary meaning；compare 2 Corinth． xi．2，Titus ii．5，and Reuss，Theol． Chret．Iv．16，Vol．x．p．170，except that he adopts this derivative meaning far too generally．On the distinction between it and ${ }^{\circ} \gamma \operatorname{los}$（＇in $\alpha \not \approx 10 s$ cogitatur potissi－ mum verecundia quæ $\alpha \not \gamma \nu \hat{̣}$ rei vel per－ sonæ debetur＇），compare Tittmann，loc． cit．

23．$\mu \eta$ кє́ть $\delta \delta \rho o \pi$ ．］＇be no longer a water－drinker．＇There is no necessity to supply＇only＇（Conyb．，Hows．，Coray， al．）；úбротот．not being exactly identi－ cal with $\delta \delta \omega \rho$ mivelv，but pointing more to the regular habit ；comp．Artemidorus


 тeiv к．т．$\lambda$ ．，and sce Winer，Gr．§ 55.8 ， p． 442 ，and the numerous examples cited by Wetstein in loc．The collocation of this precept is certainly somewhat singu－ lar，and has given rise to many different explanations．The most natural view is that it was suggested by the previous ex－ hortation，to which it acts as a kind of limitation；＇keep thyself pure，but do not on that account think it necessary to maintain an ぬoเvov á $\gamma \nu \in \iota a \nu$（Plutarch， de Iside et Osir．§6），and ascetical absti－ nences．＇To suppose that the apostle
puts it down here just as it came into his mind，fearing he might otherwise forget it（Coray in loc．），seems very unsatisfac－ tory ；still more so to regard it as a hint to Timothy to raise his bodily condition above maladies，which，it is assumed， interfered with an efficient discharge of his duties（Alford）．That the apostle＇s ＇genuine child in the faith＇（ch．i．2）was feeble in body is certain from this verse； that this feebleness affected his character is，to say the very least，a most question－ able hypothesis．It may be remarked， in conclusion，that some ascetic sects， e．$g$ ．the Essenes，were particularly dis－ tinguished for their avoidance of wine， especially on their weekly festival ；$\pi 0 \tau \delta \nu$
 Vit．Cont．§ 4，Vol．11．p．477，see § 9，p． 483，and compare Luke i．15，Rom．xiv． 21.

ठıà $\tau \dot{\partial} \nu \sigma \tau$ б́ $\mu \alpha^{-}$ $\left.\chi \chi^{\delta} \nu \sigma \circ v\right]$＇on account of thy stomach．＇ Wetstein and Kypke very appropri－ ately cite Libanius，Epist．1578，$\pi$＇́ $\pi \tau \omega \kappa \epsilon$
 тобíals．

24．$\tau เ \nu \hat{\omega} \nu$ ふे $\nu \hat{N} \rho \omega \bar{\omega} \pi \omega \nu$ к．т．入．］ The connection is not perfectly perspicu－ ous．Heinsius（Exercitat．p．491），not without some plausibility，includes ver． 23 with the last clanse of ver． 22 in a parenthesis．This seems scarcely neces－ sary ：$\sigma \in \alpha \nu \tau o ́ \nu$ к．$\tau . \lambda$ ．is a supplemen－ tary command in reference to what pre－ cedes；ver． 23 is a kind of limitation of it，suggested by some remembrance to Timothy＇s habits．The apostle then re－ verts to $\mu \eta \delta \dot{\delta} \dot{\epsilon} \kappa o t v . \dot{\alpha} \mu a \rho \tau$ ．with a senti－ ment somewhat of this nature．＇There are two kinds of sins，the one crying and open which lead the way，the other silent which follow the perpetrator to judgment ； 80 also there are open and hidden（ $\tau \dot{\alpha}$


 סúvavtal.
ever, and good works alike shall ultimately be brought to light and to judgment.' The two verses thus seem mainly added to assist Timothy in his diagnosis of character; ver. 24 appears to caution him against being too hasty in alsolving others; ver. 25 against being too precipitate in his censures ; so Huther.
$\pi \rho o ́ \delta \eta \lambda 01]$ 'openty mamifest:' the preposition does not appear to have so much a mere temporal as an intensive reference; see Heb. vii. 14, where Theod. remarks,
 compare also $\pi \rho o \gamma \rho \alpha ́ \phi \omega$ Gal. iii. I, and notes in loc. So similarly Syr. and Vulgate, both of which suppress any temporal reference in the preposition. Estius compares 'propalam,'-a form in which Hand similarly gives to 'pro' only an amplifying and intensive force, 'ut palam propositam rem plane conspiciamus,' Tursellinus, Vol. iv. p. 598.
$\pi \rho o a ́ y o v a c t ~ к . \tau . \lambda.] ~ ' g o i n g ~ b e f o r e, ~$ leading the way, to judgment,' as heralds and apparitgrs ('quasi ante-ambulones,' Beza) proclaiming before the sinner the whole history of his guilt. The 'judgment' to which they lead the way is certainly not any ecclesisstical kpifors,- for does any sucl kpíots really bring all sins and good deeds thus to light? - but either 'judgment' in its general sense with reference to men (Huth.), or, perhaps with ultimate reference to 'the final judgment' (comp. Chrys.) ; they go before the sinner to the judgment seat of Christ; see Manning, Sermon 5, Vol. irI. p. 72 , in the opening of which this text is forcibly illustrated. To limit the kpifors to the case of candidates for ordination (Alf, Wordsw.) is to give a verse almost obviously and studiedly general, a very narrow and special interpretation. So much was this felt by Basil that we
are told by Theophylact (on ver. 24) he conceived the present portion to have no connection with the $\pi \epsilon \rho \ell \tau \bar{\omega} \nu \chi$ є $\quad$ ротoviciv $\lambda$ orov, but to form a separate $\kappa \in \phi d{ }^{2} \lambda a i o v$ : eompare Cramer, Caten. Vol. vi. p. 4t, where this and the following verses form an independent section.
 follow after, sc. cis кpíctv; not merely indefinitely, 'they follow after, and so in their shorter or longer course become discovered,' De Wette,-an explanation which completely destroys image and apposition - but, ' the sins crying for vengeance follow the sinner to the tribunals; whether of his fellow-men, or, more inelusively, of his all-judging Lord; où $\gamma$ àp
 शoṽov, Theoph. ; compare Manning, l.c. On द̇акал. see notes on ver. 11: the antithesis $\pi \rho$ odrovoat precludes the assumption of any special force in $\bar{\varepsilon} \pi l_{\text {, scil. }}$.

 Coray; the only relations presented to our thoughts seen those of before and after. Kal clearly does not belong to тוglv (Huther), but is attached with a kind of descensive force to दोтакол. ; see notes on Gal. iii. 4.
25. © ©avitcs] 'in like manner:' good works are ill this respect not $\dot{\omega} s$ é $\tau$ épos to sins ; the same characteristic division may be recognized; some are open witnesses, others are secret witnesses, but their testimony cannot be suppressed. Luchmann inserts $\delta \grave{\text { è }}$ after ఉॅaúrws, with AFG; Aug, Boern., Goth. ; this reading is not improbable, but has scarcely sufficient external sup-
 'their good works ;' the repetition of the article is intended to give prominence to the epithet and niore fully to mark the
 God＇s name，honor your masters，especially if they are believers and brethren． Teach this．

antithesis between the ${ }^{\alpha} \mu \alpha \rho \tau i \alpha l$ and the кал⿳亠㐅 viri．p． 114 （ed．Rose），compare Winer， Gr．§ 20．a，p：120．On the sumewhat frequent use of the expression，$\kappa \alpha \lambda \grave{\alpha}{ }_{\epsilon} \rho \gamma \alpha$ in these Epp．，comp．notes on Tit．iii． 8. $\left.\tau \dot{\alpha} \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \omega s{ }_{\xi}^{\xi} \chi \chi O \nu \tau a\right]$＇they which are otherwise，＇i．e．which are not $\pi \rho o ́ \delta ̊ \eta \lambda \alpha$ ． To refer this to $\kappa \alpha \lambda \alpha{ }^{2}$ alike mars sense and parallelism．In the concluding words the paraphrase of Huther，＇they cannot always remain hidden＇（ $\kappa \rho \nu \beta \hat{\eta} \nu a \iota)$ ．is scarcely exact：the aor．infin．，though usually found after $\begin{gathered} \\ \chi \\ \\ \text { ，} \\ \text { súvaual，ete．}\end{gathered}$ （Winer，Gr．§．44．8，p．298），cannot wholly lose its significance，but must imply that the deeds cannot be concealed at all．They may not be patent and con－ spicuous（ $\pi \rho \delta \delta \delta \eta \lambda a]$ ，but they cannot be definitely covered up：they will be seen and recognized some time or other．

Chapter VI．1．$\dot{v} \pi \delta \zeta v \gamma \delta \nu \delta o \hat{v}-$ $\lambda_{0} \iota_{]}$＇under the yole，as bond－servants；＇． not＇servants as are under the yoke，＇ Auth．Ver．；still less＇under the yoke
 a needless $\hat{\epsilon} \nu$ סià $\delta$ vooiv．$\Delta o \hat{\lambda} \lambda o t$ is not the subject，but an explanatory predicate ap－ pended to $\cup x \delta \delta$ §uyóv，words probably in－ serted to mark，not an extreme case （＇the harshest bondage＇Bloomf．），－for the language and exhortation is perfectly gencral，－but to point to the actual cir－ cumstances of the case．They were in－ disputably ímd §uyóv，let them comport themselves accordingly．Similar exhor－ tations are found Eph，vi． 5 sq．，Col．iii． 22，Tit．ii．9，comp． 1 Cor．vii．21，all apparently directed against the very pos－ sible misconception that Christianity was
to be understood as putting master and bond－servant on an equality，or as inter－ fering with the existing social relations．
$\tau$ oùs iठíous $\delta \in \sigma \pi$ ．］＇their own masters，＇ those who stand in that distinct personal relation to them，and whom they are bound to obey；see especially the note on totos in comment．on Ephl．v．22．On the distinction between $\delta \in \sigma \pi \sigma$ óns and $\kappa \dot{v}-$
 $\delta \epsilon \sigma \pi$ ．$\delta$ é à $\rho \gamma \nu \rho \omega \nu \eta \eta^{\prime} \tau \omega \nu$ ，Ammonius，s．v．］； see Trench，Synon．§ 28．St．Paul here correctly uses the unrestricted term $\delta \in \sigma$－ $\pi \delta \dot{T \eta s}$ as more in accordance with the foregoing $\dot{\text { úd }}$ 〔uyóv，compare Tit．ii． 9 ； it is noticeable that in his other Epistles he uses кúpoos．$\quad \pi \alpha \sigma \eta S \tau \iota \mu \hat{\eta} s$ ］ ＇all honor：＇honor in every form and case in which it is due to them．On the true extensive meaning of $\pi \hat{a} s$ ，see notes on Eph．i．8．$\quad \dot{\eta} \delta \iota \delta \alpha \sigma \kappa \alpha \lambda\{\alpha]$ ＇the doctrine，＇sc．＇His doctrine，＇Syriac， Auth．Ver．：compare Tit．${ }_{\text {ii．}} 10, \tau \grave{\eta \nu}$
 סaбк．clearly points to the Gospel，the evangelical doctrine（Theodoret），which would be evil spoken of，if it were thought to inculcate insubordination；see Chrys－ ostom in loc．

2．$\pi \iota \sigma$ roús］＇believing，＇i．e．Chris－ tian masters；slightly emphatic，as the order of the words suggests．The slaves who were under heathen masters were positively to regard their masters as de－ serving of honor，the slaves under Chris－ tian masters wvere，negatively，not to evince any want of respect．The former were not to regard their masters as their infe－ riors，and to be insubordinate，the latter were not to think them their equals，and to be disrespectful．
$\mu \hat{a} \lambda \lambda o \nu$
סoun．］＇the more serve them ；$\mu \hat{\alpha} \lambda \lambda o \nu$ is

 бі́дабкє каі тарака́дєє．

If any one teach differently， he is besotted，fosters dis－ putes，and counts godliness a mere gain．Let us be con－ tented；riches are a snare and a source of many sor－ rowe．
 $\chi \epsilon \tau a \iota$ v́रıaìovaıv 入óyoıs тoîs тô̂ Kvpiov ì $\mu \hat{\omega} \nu$

not merely corrective，＇potius serviant，＇ Beza，but intensive，＇the rather，＇Hamm．， ＇magis serviant，＇Vulg．，Goth．Beza＇s correction，as is not unfrequently the case， is therefore here unnecessary ；see Hand， Tursell．s．v．＇magis，＇Vol．ini．p． 554.
ठ̈ $\tau \iota \pi \iota \sigma \tau$ ol к．$\tau . \lambda$.$] ＇because believing$ and beloved（of God）are they who，＇etc． there is some little difficulty in the con－ struction and explanation．The article， however，shows that of $\dot{\alpha} \nu \tau i \lambda$ ．is the sub－ ject，$\pi \iota \sigma \tau 0 l$ каl $\dot{\alpha} \gamma$ ．，the predicate：the recurrence of the epithet $\pi เ \sigma \tau o i$ ，and the harmony of structure still further sug－ gest that the masters，and not the ser－ vants（Wetst．，Bretschneider）are the subjects alluded to．The real difficulty lies in the interpretation of the following words．
oi $\dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \iota \lambda \alpha \mu \beta \alpha \nu \dot{\sigma} \mu$ ．］ ＇they who are partakers of，＇＇qui partici－ pes sunt，＇Vulgate，Claromanus ；so too Copt．，Gothic，Armenian，compare Syr．
－ ＇$A \nu \tau \iota \lambda \alpha \mu \beta$ ．is used．in two other passages in the N．＇T．，both in the sense＇succur－ rere，＇Luke i． 54 （LXX Isaiah xli．9，
 inapiplicable．The usual（ethical）mean－ ing in classical Greek is＇to take a part in，＇＇to engage in，＇whether simply，e．g．
 or with reference to the primitive mean－ ing，in a more intensive sense，＇to cling to，＇and thence＇secure，get possession of．＇e．g．Thucyd．ini．22，д̀ $\nu \tau i \lambda . \tau o \hat{u} \dot{\alpha} \sigma-$ фa入oûs．It does not thus seem a very serious departure from the classical mean－
ing of $\dot{a} \nu \tau i \lambda$ ．to take $i$ ，with a subdued intensive force，as＇percipere，＇＇frui＇（see Euseb．Hist．v．15，є̇̉woías toбaút $\eta \mathrm{s}$ àv－ $\tau \in \lambda$ ．，cited by Scholef．Hints，p．120，and examples in Elsner，Obs．Vol．Ir．p．306）， if we may not indeed almost give á $\nu \tau \boldsymbol{l}$ a formal reference to the reciprocal relation （compare Coray）between master and servant，and translate＇who receive in return（for food，protection，etc．）their benefit．＇In either of these latter mean－ ings，$\dot{\eta} \in \dot{v} \epsilon \rho \gamma$ ．will most simply and nat－ urally refer to the＇beneficium＇（not merely the $\epsilon \dot{v} \in \rho \gamma i(a$, Coray）shown to the master in the services and є⿱̈vooia（Eph． vi．7）of the bondservant．Chrysost．，al． refer the $\epsilon \dot{v} \in \rho \gamma \in \sigma$ í to the kind acts which the masters do to the slaves；this，though perhaps a little more lexically exact，is contextually far less satisfactory ；and this seems certainly a case where the context may be allowed to have its fullest weight in determining the meaning of the sepa－ rate words．To refer eivepréia to the divine benevolence＇（beneficentia Dei， nimirum in Christo，＇Beza）seems mani－ festly untenable．$\tau \alpha \hat{\imath} \tau \alpha$ к．т．$\lambda$. ＇these things teach and exhort；＇$\tau \grave{\text { ò }} \mu \mathrm{è} \mathrm{\nu}$
 and Lachm．both refer these words to the next clause ；so apparently Chrys．，but not Ecum．It is doubtful whether this is correct：the opposition between $\delta i$－ $\delta \alpha \sigma \kappa \in$ and $\epsilon \tau \in \rho о \delta$ ．is certainly thus more clearly scen，but the prominent position of rav̂̃a（contrast ch．iv．11）seems to suggest a more immediate connection with what precedes．For the meaning


of таракá入．，see notes ch．i．3，and on Eph．iv． 1.

3．$\in \tau \in \rho \circ \delta \iota \delta a \sigma \kappa \alpha \lambda \in \hat{i}]$＇teaches other doctrine，＇＇plays the éтєpoठเठд́⿱кка－ лos：＇comp．$\lambda \alpha i \uparrow p o \delta i \delta \alpha \sigma \kappa \alpha \lambda \epsilon i \nu$ ，Irenæus， ap．Euseb．Hist．1v．11，and see notes on ch．i． 3 ，the only other passage in the N．T．where the word occurs．
$\pi \rho \circ \sigma \in \in \rho \in \tau \alpha$, ］＇draws nigh to，＇＇as－

Bentley（Phileleuth．Lips．p．72，Lond． 1713）objects to $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \epsilon \in \rho \chi$ ．，suggesting
 son，however，for any change in the ex－ pression．Пробє́рх．，when thus used with an abstract substantive，appears to convey the ideas of＇attention to，＇e．g． $\pi \rho 0 \sigma \in \lambda \uparrow \epsilon \in \imath ิ \nu$ тoîs עó $\mu o t s$, Diod．Sic．I． 95 ， $\pi \rho \circ \sigma . \tau \hat{n} \phi \iota \lambda o \sigma o \phi i \not a$, Philostr．Ep．Socr． ii．16，and thence of＇assent to＇（comp． Acts x .28 ，and the term $\pi \rho 0 \sigma \hat{\eta} \lambda \cup \tau 01$ ）any principle or object，e．g．$\pi \rho \circ \sigma \in \lambda \uparrow \delta \partial \nu \tau \in s$ àperñ，Philo，Migr．Abr．§ 16，Vol．I．p． 449 （ed．Mang．），and still more appo－
 $\epsilon_{\rho}$ ．，Irenæus，Fragm．（Pfaff，p．27）． Bretschneider cites Ecclus．i．30，but there $\phi \delta \beta \omega$ K $\nu \rho$ ．is clearly the dative of manner．See Loesner，Obs．p． 405 sq．， where several other examples are adduc－ ed from Philo．ívıaiv． $\lambda 6$ रois］＇sound（healthful）words；＇see notes on chap．i． 10 ．$\tau 0$ is $\tau 0 \hat{v}$ Kvp． 1 ＇those of our Lord Jesus Christ，＇ i．e．which emanate from our Lord，－ either directly，or through his apostles and teachers：not the genitive objecti， ＇sermones qui sunt de Christo，＇Est．， but the gen．originis ；compare Hartung， Cusus，p．23，and notes on 1 Thess．i． 6. cal $\tau \hat{\eta} \kappa \kappa \tau$＇$\epsilon \mathfrak{v} \sigma$＇́ $\beta$ ．］＇and to the doc－ trine which is according to godliness；＇． clause，cumulatively explanatory of the foregoing；＇verba Christi vere sunt doc－
trina ad pietatem faciens，＇Grot．The expression $\dot{\eta} \kappa \frac{q}{} \tau^{\prime}$ є $\dot{v} \sigma \epsilon \in$ ，is not＇quæ ad pietatem ducit，＇Leo，Möller，－a mean－ ing，however，which，with some modifi－ cations，may be grammatically defended （comp． 2 Tim．i．1，Tit．i．1，and seeWiner， Gr．s．v．кatá，c，p．358，Rost u．Palm， Lex．ib．ir．3，Vol．i．p．1598），－but ac－ cording to the usual meaning of the prepo－ sition，＇quæ pietati consentanea est，＇Est．； there were（to imitate the language of Chrys．on Tit．i．1）different kinds of $\delta \iota-$ $\delta \alpha \sigma \kappa \alpha \lambda i ́ a ; ~ t h i s ~ w a s ~ s p e c i a l l y ~ \dot{\eta} \kappa \alpha \tau^{\prime} \in \dot{\jmath} \sigma \epsilon \in \beta$ ． бьठабка入ía．For the meaning of $\epsilon \dot{v} \sigma \in \in$ ．， see notes on ch．ii． 2.

4．$\tau \in \tau$ и́ $\phi \omega \tau \alpha \downarrow$ ］Not simply＇super－ bus est，＇Vulg．，nor even＇inflatus est，＇ Clarom．，but＇he is beclouded，besotted， with pride，＇see notes on ch．iii．6．The apodosis begins with this verse ：even if д̀фíттaбo к．т．$\lambda$ ．（Rec．）were genuine it would be impossible to adopt any other logical construction．
$\left.\mu \eta \delta \dot{\epsilon} \nu \quad \dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \tau \alpha \alpha^{\prime} \mu \in \nu \quad \mathrm{s}\right]$＇yet knowing nothing；＇see notes on ch．i．7．If it had been où $\delta \dot{\epsilon} \nu \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \tau เ \sigma \tau$ ．，it would have been a somewhat more emphatic statement of an absolute ignorance on the part of the é $\tau \in \rho \circ \delta \iota \delta \alpha ́ \sigma \kappa$ ．：it must be always observ－ ed，however，that this latter is a less usual construction in the N．T．，see Green，$G r$ ． p．122．The connection of $\mu \grave{\eta}$ and ou with participles，a portion of grammar re－ quiring some consideration，is laboriously illustrated by Gayler，Part．Neg．p． 274 －293．$\nu 0 \sigma \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \in \rho!\zeta \eta \tau$ ．］ ＇doting，ailing（op．to v́үıaıv．入óyo九），about questions：＇$\pi \epsilon p$ l marks the object round about which the action of the verb is tak－ ing place ；compare notes on ch．i． 19. In the use of $\pi \in p l$ with a gen．，the deriv－ ative meanings，＇as concerns，＇＇as re－ gards，＇greatly predominate ：the primary idea，however，still remains ：$\pi \in \rho$ l with a genitive，serves to mark an olject as the


central point; as it were, of the activity ic. g. 1 Cor. xii. 1 , the $\pi \nu \in \nu \mu$. $\delta \hat{\omega} \rho \alpha$ formcd as it were the centre of the $\left.{ }^{\circ} \gamma \nu 0 t \alpha\right)$; the further idea of any action or motion round it is supplied by $\pi \in \rho$ l with the accusative ; compare Winer, Grammar, § 47. c., p. 334, Donaldson, Grammar, §482. On $\zeta \eta \tau \eta \dot{\sigma} \sigma$ es, see notes on chap: i. 4.

入oyouax\{as|' debates about words, verbal controversies ;' äтa૬̆ $\lambda \in \gamma \dot{\mu} \mu \in \nu \alpha$; in Latin, 'verbivelitationes,' Plaut. Asin. 11. 2. 41, $\lambda$ óyov $\pi \rho o \sigma \alpha ́ \nu \tau \eta, ~ G r e g . ~ N a z . ~$ Carn. 15, Yol. II. p. 200 : 'contentiosas disputationes de verbis magis quam de rebus,' Calv. These idle and barren controversies degenerate into actual strife and contention, and give rise to bad feelings and bitter expressions of them : int
 Clem. Alex. Strom. viI. p. 759 (cited by Huther). In the following words the weight of evidence seems, on reconsideration, slightly in favor of ěpets (Tisch. ed. 7) ; we adopt it therefore instead of épts (ed. 1).
$\beta \lambda \alpha \sigma \phi \eta \mu\{\alpha$, 'evil speakings,' ' railings,' - not against God (Theodoret), but, as the context clearly implies, against one another: comp. Eph. iv. 31 and notes. On the derivation of $\beta \lambda a \sigma \phi \eta \mu \epsilon$, see notes on ch. i. 13
$\dot{v} \pi \delta \nu \circ \iota a t \pi o \nu$. is similarly referred to God, by Chrys. and Theoph.; but the context here again scems clearly to limit the words to 'evil and malevolent surmisings' against those who adopt other views. ' $\Upsilon \pi \delta \nu$., an ${ }^{\prime \prime} \pi$. $\lambda \in \gamma \delta \mu$. in the N. T., occurs not unfrequently in classical Greek joined with epithets or in a context which convey an unfiworable meaning, e. g. Demosthenes Olympiod. 1178, ข์móvotal ma入абтal каl
 e. g. Polybius, History, v 15. 1, èv imovoíc figav xaipontes, Philo, Leg.
ad Čaium, § 6, Volume ir. p. 551 (edit.
 píou.
5. $\delta \iota \alpha \pi \alpha \rho \alpha \tau \rho เ \beta \alpha\} \mid$ 'lasting conflicts,' 'obstinate contests;' 'conflictationes,' Vulg., Clarom., Syriac ○O [contritio,-see Michael. in Cast. Lex. s. v.]. The preposition סıà has here its usual and primary force of thoroughness,' 'completeness,' intensifying the meaning of the binary compound mapa-
 patp., Coray ; compare Winer, G'r. § 16. 4, p. 92. This latter word ( $\pi$ apat $\rho$.), as its derivation suggests, properly signifies ' collisions,' thence derivatively, 'hostili. ties,' 'enmities,' compare Polyb. Hist.
 трıßaí, IV. 21. 5, $\pi \alpha \rho a \tau \rho ı \beta \grave{s}$ каl фıлотъ. uías; and Xxy. 13. 5, Xxiri. 10. 4, al. There is then no allusion to moral contagion (comp. Chrysost.), but to the collision of disputants whose mere, $\lambda$ oүoua$\chi^{\text {iat had led at least to 'truces inimici- }}$ tias.' To retain $\pi \alpha \rho a \delta \delta \iota a \tau \rho \iota \beta a i \quad$ (Rec. 'profitless disputations'), as is still done by Bloomfield, following Tittmann, Synon. 1. p. 233, is contrary to every principle of sound criticism : in the lst place тарабьatp. is found only in a few cursive mss. and Theoph., while סtatap. is found in ADFGL; great majority of mss.; Clem., Basil (Griesb., Scholz, Lachm., Tisch.) ; 2ndly, it is highly probable that the reading rapaistarp. was a correction, as compounds of $\delta \iota a-\pi \alpha p a ̀ ~ a r e ~ r a r e ~ ; ~ a n d ~$ 3rdly, $\pi \alpha \rho a \delta ı a \tau \rho$. is in fact expressed in doyomax. and superfluous, while the reading of the text is perfectly natural and consistent. There are a few similar compounds, e.g. ठıamaparnpoûpat ( ${ }^{2}$ ), 2
 vi. 4, סıamapáy $\omega$, Greg. Nyss. Vol. II. p. 177, סıaтарабúpw, Schol. Lucian. Vol. 11.

p. 796 (Hemst.). $\delta t \in \phi \uparrow \propto \rho \mu$. $\left.\boldsymbol{\tau} \delta \nu \quad \nu \circ \hat{v}_{\imath}\right]$ 'corrupted in their mind.' There is no reason whatever for trans. lating yous 'intellect,' as Peile in loc., nor any scriptural evidence for the distinction he draws between the $\nu 0$ ôs as 'the noetic (?) faculty, the understanding,' and the $\phi \rho \eta \boldsymbol{\nu}$ as 'the reason.' Noîs is here, as not unfrequently in the N. T. (comp. Rom. i. 28, Eph. iv. 17, Titus i. 15, al.), not merely the 'mens speculativa,' but the willing as well as tho thinking part in man, the human $\pi \nu \in \bar{v} \mu \alpha$ in fact, not simply ' quatenus cogitat ct intelligit' (Olsh. Opusc. p. 156), but also 'quatenus vult:' $\phi \rho \grave{\eta} \nu$ ( $\phi \rho \in \dot{\nu} \in s$ ) on the other hand only occurs twice, in 1 Cor. xiv. 20. For a detailed account of $\nu$ oûs, sce Beck, Seelenlehre, II. 18, p. 49 sq., Delitzsch, Bibl. Psychol. Iv. 5, p. 139 sq., and compare also Olshausen, Opusc. p. 156, whose definitions are however rather too narrow.

The accusative, it need scarcely be remarked is an accus. ' of the remoter object,' and specifies that part of the subject $i n$, or on which the action of the verb takes place, Winer, Gi. § 32.5 , p. 204. Scheuerl. Synt. 1x. 2, p. 65. The origin of this construction is prolrably to be looked for in verbs with two accusatives which, when changed into the passive, retain the accusative rei unaltered; thence the usage became extended to other verbs, compare Krüger, Sprachl. § 52. 4. 2 sq., Hartung, Cusus, p. 61 sq.
$\dot{\alpha} \pi \in \sigma \tau \in \rho . \tau \hat{\eta} s \dot{\alpha} \lambda$. 'destitute of the truth,' immediate consequence of the foregoing : they were not only $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \eta \mu$. $\tau \hat{\eta} s \dot{\alpha} \lambda$. . ( $\sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \in \epsilon$, however, docs not occur in N. T. ), but à $\pi \in \sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \eta \mu$. ; the truth was taken away from them; compare ch. i. 19, Tit. i. 14, where its first rejection is stated as the act of the unhappy men themselves.
$\pi о \rho i \sigma \mu \delta \nu \kappa . \tau . \lambda$.$] ' that godliness is a$ source of gain ;' clearly not, as the article
proves (Jelf, Gr. $\$ 460.1$ ), 'that gain is godliness, as Syr. and Auth. Ver. Пopıб$\mu$ oेs appears here and v. 6 not so much 'gain' in the abstract, as 'a source or means of gain' ('a gainful trade,' Conybeare) ; comp. Plutarch, Cuto Major, § 25, $\delta \cup \sigma l \kappa \in \chi \rho \hat{\eta} \sigma \hat{*} \alpha \iota \mu \dot{\nu} \nu u l s$ торı $\sigma \mu$ ôs $\gamma \in \omega \rho$ रia kal $\phi \in \iota \delta o i ̄ ;$ and on the termination - $\mu \mathrm{os}$, Donaldson Cratyl. § 253, Lobeck, Phryn. p. 511. The sentiment of the verse is expressed more fully, Tit. i. 11,

 тooov́тшע with KL, Syr. (hoth), al., but the authorities for the umission, AD$)^{\prime} \mathrm{FG}$; Vulg. Clarom., Goth., Copt., al., very distinctly preponderate.
6. $\pi$ o $\rho \iota \sigma \mu \delta s$ has here no immediate spiritual reference (Matth.) to future and heavenly gain (oíwvtoy $\pi$ тopi $\zeta_{\epsilon \iota} \zeta \omega \dot{\eta} \dot{\nu}$, Theod.) but points rather to the actual gain in this life, and the virtual riches which godliness when accompanied by aùтd́pк. (comp. notes on ch. i. 11, and on Eph. vi. 23) unfailingly supplies ; кє́pōos é $\sigma \tau i v$

 CEcum. ; similarly Chrysost., Theoph. : 'the heart, amid every outward want, is then only truly rich when it not only wants nothing which it has not, but has that which raises it above what it has not,' Wiesinger. Pagan authors (see examples in Suicer, Thesaur. Vol. I. p. 575) have similarly spoken of airdóok. being gain ; the apostle associates av̀兀 а́рк. with $\epsilon \dot{v} \sigma \epsilon \beta$., and gives the mere ethical truth a higher religious significance. $\alpha \dot{v} \tau a \rho \kappa \in \mathbb{I} a s]_{\text {. 'contentedness,' not 'com- }}$ petency,' Hamm.; 'sufficientia est animus suâ sorte contentus, ut aliena non appetat nec quidquam extra se quærat,' Justin. in loc.: compare the perhaps slightly more exact definition of Clem. Alex. Pced. ir. 12, Vol. I. p. 247 (Pot-



［see Estius］，кal $\delta \iota^{’}$ avivท̂s $\pi о р เ \sigma \tau เ \kappa \grave{\eta} \tau \omega ิ \nu$ $\pi \rho \partial s ~ \tau \delta \nu \quad \mu \alpha \kappa \alpha ́ p i o \nu ~ \sigma u \nu \tau \epsilon \lambda o u ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu$ ßiov． The subst．occurs again in 2 Cor．ix．8， but objectively，scil．＇sufficiency；＇－a meaning which obviously would not be suitable in the present case；aù兀ápкəs occurs Phil．iv． 11.

7．ov̉ $\delta$ ह̀ $\nu \gamma \alpha \rho$ ］Confirmation of the preceding clause，especially of the last words in it，$\mu \in \tau \grave{\alpha}$ aùтаркєlas．As we brought nothing into the world，and as that very fact implies that we shall carry nothing out（comp．Job i．21），our real source of gain must be something inde－ pendent of what is merely addititious，
 $\mu \in ́ \lambda \lambda \lambda о \mu \in \nu$ ย̇кє̂̂ $\sigma v \nu \epsilon \pi \alpha ́ \gamma \epsilon \sigma \lambda \alpha a l$ ，Theophyl．； we entered the world with nothing，we shall leave the world with nothing，why should we then grasp after treasures so essentially earthly and transitory？
 also take anything out；＇these words are clearly emphatic，and contain the princi－ pal thought：＇excutit natura redeuntem sicut intrantem，＇Senec．Epist．102．It is this inability to take anything away which furnishes the most practical argu－ ment for the truth of the assertion．If we could take anything out there would be an end to aú ápкєьa；our present and future lots would be felt too closely de－ pendent on each other for a patient ac－ quiescence in any assigned state ：piety with contentment would then prove no great $\pi$ opı $\sigma \mu$ b́s．
 conditional member（comp．Donaldson， Gr．§ 505）introducing a partial contrast to what precedes ：the $\delta \in$ is thus not for oĩv，Syr．，－a particle which would give a different turn to the statement，－still less equivalent to kal，Auth．Version，but points to a suppressed thought suggested

addititious we must certainly have whiie we are in this world，but if，＇etc．．The opposite force of the particle is thus prop－ erly preserved：＇aliquid in mente habet ad quod respiciens oppositionem infert，＇ Flotz，Devar．Vol．11．p．365，compare notes on Gal．iii． 11.
$\delta \iota \alpha \tau \rho \circ \phi \grave{\alpha} s$ кai $\sigma \kappa$ ．］＇food and cloth－ ing；＇both words ám，$\lambda \in \gamma \delta \mu$ ．in the N．T． The prep．in the former substantive per－ haps may hint at a fairly sufficient and permanent supply，compare Xen．Mem．
 $\zeta \hat{\eta} \delta \alpha \psi \iota \lambda \hat{\omega} s$ ．The latter substantive prob－ ably only refers to＇clothing＇，Clarom．， Arm．，not to＇shelter，＇Goth．（？），Peile， or to both，as Vulg．（？），＇quibus tega－ mur，＇De Wette ；for see Aristotle，Polit． viI．17，бкє́таб $\mu \alpha \mu \kappa \kappa р \grave{\nu ~ a ̉ \mu \pi เ \sigma \chi \in i ̂ \nu ~(W e t-~}$ stein），and compare the passage cited by Wolf out of Sext．Empir．IX．1，т $\rho \circ \phi \hat{\eta} s$ $\kappa a i ̀ ~ \sigma \kappa \in \pi a \sigma \mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu ~ \kappa a l ~ \tau \eta ิ s ~ a ̆ \lambda \lambda \eta s ~ \tau о \hat{v} \sigma \omega ́ \mu \alpha-$ tos $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \pi t \mu \in \lambda \epsilon$ ías，where it similarly does not seem necessary（with Fabricius）to extend the reference ：so also Chrys．，all the Greek expositors，and appy．Syr．，as $1 \Delta^{0}=\frac{\square}{2}$［tegumentum］occurs else－ where，e．g．Acts xii． 8 ，in definite refer－ ence to a garment．
ג⿱㇒日$\rho \kappa \in \sigma \mathfrak{N} \eta \sigma \delta \mu \in \mathcal{N} \alpha]$＇we shall be satis－ fied：＇the use of the future is slightly doubtful．It does not seem exactly im － peratival，Goth．，Auth．Version，－though this meaning might be defended，see Winer，Gram．§43．5，p．282，nor even ethical，＇we ought to be，we must be so，＇ compare Bernhardy，Synt．x．5，p．377， －but，as the following verse seems to suggest，more definitely future，and as stating what will actually be found to con－ stitute aùtápкєıa；＇${ }^{\text {simul }}$ etiam affirmare aliquid intendit apostolus，＇Estius，who with Hammond refers to Syr．（＇sufficient to us are＇）where this view is more




roughly expressed ：so appy．Green，Gr． p． 27 ，and De W．，who refers the future to what might＇reasonably be expected．＇ For the practical applications of this text see 10 sermons by Bp．Patrick，Works， Vol．1x．p． 44 sq．（Oxf．1858）．
9．of $\delta$ हे к．т．入．］Class of persons opposed to those last mentioned．Chrys－ ostom with his usual acuteness calls at－


 катафроуồvта аùtūv．
$\pi \alpha \gamma[\delta a]$＇$a$ snare；＇not＇snares，＇Syr． （comp．Bloomf．），but＇a snare，＇scil．тô̂ סıaßó̊ov，which D ${ }^{1}$ FG；Vulg．，Clarom．， al．，actually add．There is，of course， here no $\hat{e} \nu$ סià סuoî̀（Coray）：the latter substantive somewhat specifies and partic－ ularizes the former．The form the temp－ tation assumed was that of an entangling power，from which it was not easy for the captive to extricate himself；comp． Möller in loc．

ả עońtous］ ＇foolish ：＇on the proper meaning of this word，and its distinction from ăфpov and à $\begin{array}{r}\text { viveros，see notes on Gal．iii．1．The }\end{array}$ Vulg．，a few other $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$ ．，and three mss． read àvovítous，a wholly unnecessary correction ：the lusts involved elements of what was foolish as well as what was hurtful；Chrysostom explains specifi－ cally．aitıves］＇which indeed，＇＇seeing they；＇explanatory of the foregoing epithets，more especially of the last ：on the force of $\begin{aligned} & \text { zotis see notes on }\end{aligned}$ Gal．iv． 24.

及usił̧ovaเข］ ＇drown，＇＇whelm in；＇only here and
 datio，＇Beng．The word，as Kypke sug－ gests，＇subinnuit infinita et ineluctabilia esse mala in quæ precipites dantur av－
ari，＇Obs．．Vol．II．p． 367 ；there is，how－ ever，no idea of＇preceps dari，＇nor is it a metaphor from a ship＇that is plunged head foremost into the sea，＇Bloomf．，who cites Polyb．11．10．2，where＇̇ं $\beta \dot{\prime}$ Itrav means，as the verb always does，＇caused to sink，＇without any referenco whatever to direction．

ชै入є งิpov ка！ à $\pi \dot{\omega} \lambda$.$] ＇destruction and perdition．＇The$ force of the compound form（à $\pi \delta$ marks ＇completion，＇compare à $\pi \epsilon \rho \gamma \dot{\text { áSouaı al．，}}$ Rost u．Palm，Lex．s．v．à $\pi \delta$ ，e 4）and more abstract termination of the latter word perhaps afford a hint that a climac－
 termination，see Pott，Et Forsch．Vol． ir．p．555］is＇destruction，＇in a general sense，whether of body or soul ；àmédeia intensifies it by pointing mainly to the latter．＂OגeNpos is only used by St．Paul，
 aipviótos ò o．द́申iotacat，where it points more to temporal destruction，and 2 Thess．i． 9 （Tisch．），where the epithet aiduos is specially added to support its application to final＇perdition．＇
10．$\langle i \zeta \bar{S}]$＇$a$ root，＇or perhaps rather ＇the root，＇Copt．，the absence of the article probably not leaving it to be implied that there are other vices which might be termed＇roots of all evils＇（ed．1，comp． Middl．，Gr．Art．11r．4．1，p． 51 sq．），but simply disappearing owing to the rule of subject and predicate overriding the law of＇correlation＇Middl．Art．111．3．6）； compare Lysias，de Cied．Erutosth．$\S 7$ ，

 Demosth．de Mrgalop．§ 28，p．208，శav－
 example urged by Alford（1 Cor．xi．3） is not fully in point，for（1）the article is

#   

Follow after righteourness and Christian virtues, fight the good मight, and in Christ's name keep His commands, even-till His glorious coming; glory to Eim; amen.



inserted in the first member, and (2) in the second member the governed substantive is anarthrous and in the third a proper name. In illustration of the general form of the expression, comp. Plut.


$\phi \iota \lambda \alpha \rho \gamma \cup \rho i \alpha]$ 'love of money;' ${ }^{\circ} \pi \pi_{0} \lambda \epsilon-$ $\gamma \delta \mu$. in the N. T.; the adjective occurs twice, Luke xvi. 14, 2 Tim. iii. 2. The kindred but more general and active sin $\pi \lambda \in o \nu \in \xi^{\prime}(\alpha$ is that which was dwelt upon by the sacred writers. On the distinction between these words (which however is on the surface) see Trench, Synon. § 24, but comp. notes on Eph. iv. 19. The sentiment is illustrated by Suicer, Thes. Vol. 11. p. 1427.

ท̂s
$\delta \rho \in \gamma \delta \mu$.] 'which some reaching out after.' Commentators have dwelt much upon the impropriety of the image, it being asserted that $\phi \iota \lambda a \rho \gamma u p i \alpha$ is itself an $\partial \rho \in \xi, \xi^{\prime}$ (De Wette.). The image is certainly not perfectly correct, but if the passive nature of фı入apyupía (see Trench, lc.) be remembered, the violation of the im. age will be less felt. Under any circumstances òpeүóuєขo九 cannot be correctly translated 'giving themselves up to, Bretschn., al. Both here, ch. iii. 1, and Heb. xi. 16, the only passages in the N. T. where the word occurs, $\dot{\omega} \rho \notin \notin\{a t o, ~ S y r . ~$ T, sideravit ' $\mid$ is simply 'desired,' 'coveted,' literally 'reached out the hands eagerly to take; ' comp. Donalds. Cratyl. §477. On the derivation ( $o-\rho \in \gamma$, compare 'rego'), see Donalds. ib, and Pott,

Etym. Forsch. Vol. 1. p. 219, Vol. II. p. 167. $\pi \in \rho \iota \in \in \pi \in \iota \rho a \nu]$ 'pierced themselves through;' व̈л. $\lambda \in \gamma \delta \mu$. in N. T. ; compare Philo, in Flacc. § 1, Vol. Ir. p. 517 (ed. Mang.), àspóous àvp̣ке́бтоเs $\pi \in \rho เ \epsilon ́ \pi \epsilon \iota \rho \in$ какоі̂s, and the numerous instances of a similar metaphorical use collected by Suicer, s. v. The prop. $\pi \epsilon \rho i$ does not here define the action as taking place 'round ' or 'about' ('undiquaque,' Beza), but conveys the idea of 'piercing,' 'going through,' - a meaning well maintained by Donalds. Cratyl. § 178 ; compare Lucian, Gull. § 2, кр'́є - $\pi \epsilon \rho ı \pi \epsilon \pi \alpha \rho \mu \epsilon ́ v \alpha$ тoîs ò $\beta \in \lambda o i ̂ s$, Diod. Sic. xvi. $80, \lambda \delta \partial \gamma \chi$ aus $\pi \in \rho \iota \pi \in є \rho \delta \mu \in \nu 0$. The joíval here mentioned are not merely outward evils ('gravissima mala hujus sæculi,' Estius), nor even the anxious cares (Justin.) or desires (Chrysostom) which accompany $\phi i \lambda a \rho \gamma u p i ́ a$, but more probably the gnawings of conscience,'conscientiæ de male partis mordentis;' Bengel. The word óoúvn (only here and Rom. ix. 2), it may be remarked, is not derived from ósoús (Bloomf.), but from a root $\Delta \Upsilon$ - (comp. סún), with a vowel prefix ; see Pott. Etym. Forsch. Vol. I. p. 210.
11. $\sigma \dot{v}$ ' $\delta \dot{\epsilon}]$ 'But thou,' in distinct contrast to the preceding $\tau เ \nu$ és, ver: 10 .
ă $\nu \geqslant \rho \omega \pi \epsilon$ rô $\Theta \epsilon \omega \hat{v}]$ It is doubiful whether this is an official term (sc. ' Dei internuncius,' אֵּ אֹ, compare 2 Pet. i. 21 ), or merely a general designation. The former view is adopted by Theodoret, and is certainly plausible, as the evangelists' office ( 2 Tim. iv. 5) in the N. T. might be fairly compared with


that of the prophets in the O．T．：as， however，the context is of a perfectly general character，it seems more natural to give the expression a more extended reference，as in 2 Tim．iii． 17 ；comp．


 оікєเడَ $\epsilon \omega$ ． $\tau a \hat{v} \tau a]$ The reference of this pronoun is frequently a matter of difficulty in this Epistle：it seems here most naturally to refer to ver． 9,10 ，i．e．to $\phi ı \lambda \alpha \rho \gamma u p i ́ a$ ，and the evil principles and results associated with it， ＇avaritiam et peccata quæ ex illá radice procedunt，＇Estius．
§เкаเoб⿱㇒日勺 $\nu \eta \nu$ ］＇righteousness；＇not merely＇justice；＇but either the virtue which is opposed to adockía（Rom．vi．13）， and to the general tendency of the pow－ ers of evil（2 Cor．xi．15），or，as appy． here and 2 Tim．ii． 22 ，iii． 16 ，in a more general sense，－＇right conduct conform－ able to the law of God＇（2 Cor．vi．14， compare Tit．ii．12）；see Reuss，Theol． Chret．Iv．16，Vol．I．p．169，Usteri， Lehrb．II．1．2，p．190．On the more strictly dogmatic meaning see the excel－ lent remarks in Knox，Remains，Vol．I． p． 276 ．$\pi\{\sigma \tau \iota \nu]$＇futh，＇

 ty，＇＇die einzelne christliche Pfliget der Treue，＇Usteri，Lehrb．II．1．1，p．92， note．On iтоцоуй，＇perseverantia，＇ ＇brave patience＇（＇malorum fortis tole－ rantia，＇Grot．on Rom．viii．25），see notes on 2 Tim．ii．10，and on Tit．ii． 2.
$\pi \rho \alpha \ddot{v} \pi \alpha$＇$\uparrow \in\lfloor\alpha \nu]$ ．＇meekness of heart or feelings ；＇a word of rare occurrence （Philo de Abrah．§ 37，Vol．I1．p．31，Ig－ natius Trall．8），perhaps slightly more specific than $\pi \rho a \hat{u} \tau \eta s$, scil．$\pi \rho a \tilde{u} \tau \eta s{ }_{\mathrm{O}}^{\mathrm{\delta}} \lambda \omega \nu$ $\pi \omega ิ \nu \pi \alpha \Delta \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \hat{\eta} s \psi u \chi \hat{\eta}, s$, Coray in loc．The reading of the Rec．$\pi \rho \alpha \dot{\sigma} \tau \eta \tau \alpha$（with

DKL．；al．；Chrys．，Theod．）has every appearance of being a mere correction， and is rejected even by Scholz．The virtues here mentioned seem to group themselves into pairs ；$\delta \iota \kappa a \iota o \sigma$ ．and $\epsilon \dot{\jmath} \sigma \in \in \beta$ ． have the widest relations，pointing to general conformity to God＇s law and practical piety；$\pi i \sigma \tau \iota s$ and $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \alpha \dot{\pi} \eta$ are the fundamental principles of Christian－ ity ；$\dot{\text { ú }} \boldsymbol{\mu}$ ．and $\pi \rho a \ddot{\pi} \pi$ ．，the principles on which a Christian ought to act towards his gainsayers and opponents ；compare Huth．The article is occasionally omit－ ted before abstract nouns，see examples in Winer，Gr．§ 19．1，p． 109.

12．$\tau \delta \nu \kappa \alpha \lambda \delta \nu \dot{\alpha} \gamma \hat{\omega} \nu a]$＇the good strife，＇Hamm．；the contest and struggle which the Christian has to maintain against the world，the flesh，and the devil ；comp． 2 Tim．iv．7．It is doubt－ ful how far the agonistic metaphor is to be maintained in this verse．Grammat－ ical considerations seem certainly in fa－ vor of the two imperatives（here，on ac－ count of the emphatic asyndeton，without wal）being referred both to the metaphor－ ical contest，＇strive the good strife，and （in it and through it）seize hold on eter－ nal life，＇Winer，Gr．§ 43．2，p． 279 ；it is，however，very doubtful whether the remaining expressions，кaлeì（as by the
 tors？see Hammond in loc．），can fairly be regarded as parts of the continued metaphor．In eis $\eta \nu$ ，as De Wette has observed，there would in fact be an impro－
 arena into which the combatants were called，but has just been represented as the Bpaßєîov and є̈maìлov（Theophyl．）， the object for which they wero to con－ tend．Similar，but more sustained allu－ sions to the Olympic contests occur in 1 Cor．ix． 24 sq．，Phil．iii． 12.
＇$\pi: \lambda \alpha \beta \circ \hat{\nu}$ ］＇lay hold of；＇only here and


ver. 19 in St. Paul's Epp., three times in Heb., and frequently in St. Luke:
 $\pi a \iota \delta \epsilon i a s, \mu \eta े \grave{\alpha} \phi \hat{\jmath} s$. The change to the aor. imperf, must not be left unnoticed ; it was one act in the $\dot{a} \gamma \dot{\omega} \nu$; see the exx. in Winer, Gr. § 43. 4, p. 281. The usual sequence, first pres. imp. then aor. imper. (Schömann, Isceus, p. 235), is here observed : there are exceptions, however, e. g. 1 Cor, xv. 34. In the application of the verb there is no impropriety ; oi $\omega$ voos. $\zeta \omega$ クे (the epithet slightly emphatic; see notes on ch. i. 5) is held out to us as the prize, the crown, which the Lord will give to those who are faithful unto the end ; compare James i. 12, Rev. ii. 10. ка! $\dot{\mu} \mu \boldsymbol{\lambda}$ ó $\gamma \eta \sigma \alpha s$ ] 'and thou confessedst,' or 'madest confes.,' etc., not 'hast made,' Scholef. Hints, p. 125,-an inexact translation for which there is here no idiomatic necessity. Kal has here its simple copulative power, and subjoins to the foregoing words another and coordinate ground of encouragement and exhortation ; 'thou wert called to eternal life, and thou madest a good profession.' The extremely harsh construc-
 (Leo, al.), is rightly rejected by De W. and later expositors.
$\tau \dot{\eta} \nu \kappa \alpha \lambda \dot{\eta} \nu \quad \delta \mu \circ \lambda \circ \rho$.] 'the good confes-sion,- of faith' (De W.), or,- ' of the Gospel ' (Scholef.) ; good, not with reference to the courage of Timothy, but to its own import (Wiesing.). But made when? Possibly on the occasion of some persecution or trial to which Tim. was ex-
 X $\rho$., Theophyl. 1 ; more probably at his
 EEcumenius, Theoph. 2, and apparently Chrys. ; but, perhaps, most probably, at his ordination, Neander, Planting, Vol. II. p. 162 (Bohn) ; see chap. iv. 14, and
compare $\mathrm{i}, 18$. The general reference to a 'confessio, non verbis concepta sed potius re ipsá edita ; neque id semel duntaxat sed in toto ministerio' (Calv., see also Theodoret), seems wholly precluded by the definite character of the language. The meaning ' oblation' urged by J. Johnson, Unbl. Sacr. II. 1, Vol. I. p. 223(A.-C. Libr.), is an interpretation which $\delta \mu о \lambda о$ ria cannot possibly bear in the N. T ; see 2 Cor. ix. 13, Heb. iii. 1, iv. 14, x. 23.
13. $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \gamma \gamma \epsilon \in \lambda \omega \sigma 0$ к. $\tau . \lambda$.] The exhortation, as th: Epistle draws to its conclusion, assumes a yet graver and more earnest tone. The apostle having reminded Timothy of the confession he made, ėv $\dot{\pi} \pi$. $\pi о \lambda \lambda$. $\mu a p \tau$., now gives him charge, in the face of a more tremendous
 $\kappa \cdot \tau \cdot \lambda$., not to disgrace it by failing to keep the commandment which the Gospel imposes on the Christian.
$\tau 0 \hat{v}$ Sworovồvos] 'who keepeth alive;'. not perfectly synonymous (De W., Huth.) with $\zeta$ woroo. the reading of the Rec. : the latter points to God as the 'auctor vitæ,' the former as the 'conservator;' compare Luke xvii. 33, Acts vii. 19, and especially Exod. i. 17, Judg. viii. 19 , where the context clearly shows the proper meaning and force of the word. Independently of external evidence [ADFG opposed to KL], the reading of the text seems on internal grounds more fully appropriate ; Timothy is exhorted to persist in his Christian course in the name of Him who extends His almighty protection over all things, and is not only the Creator, but the Preserver of all His creatures ; comp. Matth. x 29 sq. $\mu \alpha \rho \tau v \rho \dot{\eta} \sigma \alpha \nu \tau 0$ S к. т. $\lambda$.] 'who witnessed, bore witness to, the good confession.' It seems by no means correct to regard $\mu a \rho \tau u \rho \in i ̂ \nu ~ \tau \hat{\eta} \nu$ $\delta \mu 0 \lambda$. as simply synonymous with $\delta \mu 0 \lambda$.


$\tau \grave{\nu} \delta \mu \circ \lambda$. (Leo, Huth. al.) ; the difference of persons and circumstances clearly caused the difference of the expressions, 'testari confessionem erat Domini, confiteri confessionem erat Timothei,' Bengel. Our Lord attested by his sufferings and death ( $\delta \iota^{*} \hat{\omega} \nu$ èr $\pi \rho a \tau \tau \in \nu$, CEcum.) the truth of the $\delta \mu 0 \lambda o \gamma i a$ (' martyrio complevit et consignavit, Est.) ; Timothy only confesses that which his Master had thus authenticated. The use of $\mu a p \tau$. with an accusative is not unusual (comp. Demosthenes Steph. I. p. 117, $\delta \iota \alpha \uparrow \eta \kappa र ो \nu ~ \mu \alpha \rho \tau v-$ peiv), bui $\mu a \rho \tau$. $\delta \mu 0 \lambda o \gamma_{i} a \nu$ is an expression confessedly somewhat anomalous : it must be observed, however, that the $\delta \mu 0 \lambda o \gamma i a$ itself was not our Lord's testimony before Caiaphas, Matth. xxvi. 64, Mark xiv. 62, Luke xxii. 69 (Stier, Red. Jes. Vol. vi. p. 386), nor that before Pilate, John xvii. 36 (Leo, Huther), but, as in ver. 12 (see notes) the Christian confession generally, the good confession $\kappa \alpha \tau^{3}{ }^{\xi} \xi \sigma \chi \eta \eta^{\prime}$. The expression thus considered, seems less harsh.
$\dot{\epsilon} \pi$ ! חovv\{ov, in accordance with the previous explanation of $\delta \mu \circ \lambda o \gamma^{i} a$, is thus 'sub Pontio Pilato,' Vulg., Est., De W., not 'before Pontius Pilate,' Syr., Жth., (Platt), Arm., Chrys, al., - a meaning perfectly grammatically admissible (see notes on ch. v. 19, Hermann Viger, No. 394, comp. Pearson, Creed, Vol. II. p. 153, ed. Burt.), but irreconcilable with the foregoing explanation of $\delta \mu o \lambda o \gamma i \alpha$. The usual interpretation of this clause, and of the whole verse, is certainly plausible, but it rests on the assumption that $\mu a p \tau$. т $\eta \nu \delta \mu \circ \lambda$. is simply synonymous with $\delta \mu 0 \lambda o \gamma \epsilon i \nu \nu \tau \nu \nu \delta \mu \lambda$., and it involves the necessity of giving $\dot{\eta} \kappa a \lambda \eta\rangle \delta \mu \nu \lambda$. a different meaning in the two verses. Surely, in spite of all that Huther has urged to the contrary, the $\delta \mu 0 \lambda o \gamma i a$ of Christ before Pilate must be regarded
(with De Wette) a very inexact parallel to that of Timothy, whether at his baptism or ordination; and for any other confession, before a tribunal, etc., we have not the slightest evidence either in the Acts or in these two Epp. We retain then with Vulg., Clarom., Goth. (De Gabel.), and perhaps Coptic, the temporal and not locul meaning of $\bar{\pi} \pi$ !.
14. $\left.\tau \eta \rho \hat{\eta} \sigma \alpha_{t}\right]$ Infin. dependent on the foregoing verb $\pi \alpha \rho a \gamma \gamma \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \lambda \omega$. The purport of the évtodiे which Timothy is here urged to keep has been differently explained. It may be (a) all that Timothy has been enjoined to observe throughout the Epistle (Calvin, Beza) ; or, (b) the command just given by the apostle $\tau \alpha u ̂ \tau \alpha$ â $\gamma \rho \alpha \dot{\phi} \omega$, Theodoret (who, however, afterwards seems to regard it as $=\uparrow$ cía бьбабкалía), and perhaps Auth. Version; or, most probably, (c) the commandment of Christ,- not specially the ' mandatum dilectionis,' John xiii. 34, but generally the law of the Gospel (comp. $\eta$ § $\pi a p a \gamma \gamma \epsilon-$ $\lambda$ ía ch. i. 5), the Gospel viewed as a rule of life, Huth. ; see especially Titus ii. 12, where the context seems distinctly to favor this interpretation.
$\dot{a} \sigma \pi \iota \lambda o \nu \dot{\alpha} \nu \in \pi$ 亿́ $\lambda \eta \mu \pi \tau \circ \nu]$ 'spotless, irreproachable,' 2. e. so that it receive no stain and suffer no reproach; $\mu \boldsymbol{\eta} \boldsymbol{\tau} \boldsymbol{\delta} \delta \boldsymbol{\gamma}$ -
 трı\&́áuevov, Chrys. [the usual dat. with $\pi \rho o \sigma \tau \rho$. e. g. Plut. Mor. p. 89, 859, 869, is omitted, but seems clearly $\begin{gathered}\text { éro } \\ \lambda \hat{p}\} ; ~\end{gathered}$ compare Theod. $\mu \eta \delta \grave{\epsilon} \nu$ ảva $\mu(\xi \eta s$ à $\lambda \lambda \sigma \tau$ piov т $\mathfrak{y}$ స̦eía $\delta เ \delta \alpha \sigma \kappa \alpha \lambda i ́ a$. . As both these epithets are in the N. T. referred only to persons ( $\alpha \sigma \pi$. James i. 27, 1 Pet. i. 19, 2 Pet. iii. 14 ; à $\nu \in \pi i \hat{\lambda} .1$ Tim. iii. 2, v. 7), it seems very plausible to refer them to Timothy (Copt., Beza, al.) ; the construction, however, seems so distinctly to favor the more obvious connection with द̀vro入h p (comp. ch. v. 22, 2 Cor. xi. 9,



James i. 27 ; [Clem. Rom.] Ep. ir. 8, $\tau \eta \rho$. $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \sigma \phi \rho \alpha \gamma \hat{i} \sigma \alpha \alpha \alpha \sigma \pi t \lambda o \nu)$, and the ancient Versions, Vulg., Clarom., Syriac (apparently), al., seem mainly so unanimous, that the latter reference is to be preferred; so De W., Huther. The objection that $\alpha \nu \in \pi i \lambda$. can only be used with persons (Est., Heydenr.), is disposed of by De W., who compares Plato, Plileb. p. 43 c, Philo, de Opif. § 24, Vol. x. p. 17 ; add Polyb. Hist. xiv. 2. 14, àvє $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ l$\lambda \eta \pi \tau$ os $\pi \rho \circ a i \rho \in \sigma \iota s$. The more grave objection, that $\tau \eta \rho \in \hat{\epsilon} \nu \bar{\epsilon} ย \tau \tau o \lambda i n \nu$ means 'to observe, not to conserve, a commandment' (comp. Wiesing.), may be diluted by observing that tnpeiv in such close connection with the epithets may lose the normal meaning it has when joined with évro入خ̀ $\nu$ alone: it is not merely to keeping the command, but to keeping it spotless, that the attention of Timothy is directed. This is a case in which the opinion of the ancient interpreters should be allowed to have some weight. For the meaning of $\dot{\alpha} \nu \in \pi i \lambda$. see notes on ch. iii. 2.
$\tau \hat{\eta} s \in \in \iota \phi \alpha \nu \in\{\alpha s]$ 'the appearing,' the visible manifestations of our Lord at His second advent; see 2 Tim. iv. 1, 8, Tit. ii. 13, and comp. Reuss, Theol. Chrét. Iv. 21, Vol. 11. p. 230. This expression, which, as the context shows, can only be referred to Christ's coming to judgment, not merely to the death of 'Timothy ( $\mu$ é $\chi \rho \stackrel{ }{\rho}$ $\tau \hat{\eta} s$ ékóoov, Chrysostom, Theoph.), has been urged by De W. and others as a certain proof that St. Paul conceived the Advent as near; so even Reuss, Théol. 1II. 4, Vol. 1. p. 308. It may perhaps be admitted that the sacred writers have used language in reference to their Lord's return (comp. Hammond, on 2 Thess. ii. 8), which seems to show that the longings of hope had almost become the convictions of belief, yet it must also be observed that (as in the present case) this
language is often qualified by expressions which show that they also felt and knew that that hour was not immediately to be looked for ( 2 Thess. ii. 2), but that the counsels of God, yea, and the machinations of Satan ( 2 Thess. ib.) must require time for their development.
15. katpoîs iốoss] 'His own seasons:' see notes on ch. ii. 6, and on Tit. i. 3. ' Numerus pluralis observandus, brevitatem temporum non valde coarctans,' Bengel. $\delta \in\{\xi \in i\}$ 'shall display;' not a Hebraism for $\pi<\iota \eta$ 'ทєı or $\tau \in \lambda \epsilon \in \sigma \in \iota$, Coray: the è $\pi$ rıфáveta of our Lord is, as it were, a mighty $\sigma \eta \mu \in i ̂ \nu$ (comp. John ii. 18) which God shall display to men. $\quad \delta \mu \alpha \kappa \alpha ́ \rho t o s \mid$ Compare notes on ch. i. 11. Chrysost. and Theophyl. regard the epithet as consolatory, hinting at the absence of every element of $\tau \delta \lambda u \pi \eta \rho \partial ̀\rangle \geqslant$ à $\eta \delta$ ès in the heavenly King: Theod. refers it to the árp $\epsilon \pi \tau 0 \nu$ of His will. The context seems here rather to point to His exhaustless powers and perfections.
$\mu \delta \dot{\nu} o s \quad \delta u \nu a ́ \sigma \tau \eta s]$ 'only potentate;' it is scarcely necessary to say that $\mu$ óvos involves no illusion to the polytheism of incipient Gnosticism (Conyb. and Howson, Baur, al), but is simply intended to enhance the substantive, by showing the uniqueness of the $\delta u \nu a \sigma \tau \epsilon i a$. God is the absolute $\delta u \nu d \sigma t \eta s$ 人isen
 iac ; to no one save to Him can that predication be applied; compare Eph. iii.
 52 , Acts viii. 27 , and in reference to God, 2 Macc. iii. 24, xii. 15, xv. 4, 23. On the dominion of God, see Pearson, Creed, Art. I. Vol. I. p. 51 (ed. Burt.), Charnock, Attributes, xili. p. 638 (Bohn). $\beta a \sigma \iota \lambda \in$ iे s к. т. $\lambda$.] 'King of kings and

 aíóvıov, ả $\mu \dot{\eta} \nu$.

Charge the rich not to trust in riches, but in God, and to store up a good foundation.



Lord of lords ;' so $\beta a \sigma \iota \lambda \in \dot{\iota} s \beta a \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon \omega \omega$, Rev. xvii. 14, xix. 16 (in reference to the Son; see Waterl. Def. 5, Vol. i. p. 326), and similarly. kúpıos кupíwv, Deut. x. 17, Psalm exxxv. (cxxxvi.) 3,- both formulæ added still more to heighten and illustrate the preceding title. Loesner cites from Philo, de Dec. Orac. p. 749 [Vol. II. p. 187, ed. Mang.], a similar


 Baбt $\lambda \epsilon \epsilon \omega \nu$ каil $\Theta \epsilon \partial s$ Ө $\Theta \omega \bar{\nu}$ : comp. Suicer, Thesaur. Vol, i. p. 670.
16. $\delta \mu$ б́vos к. т. $\lambda . \mid$ 'who alone hath immortality;' He in whom immortality essentially exists, and who enjoys it neither derivatively nor by participation :

 тท̂s oikeías oủбías, Just. Mart. Queest. 61, oủoía àsávaros ou $\mu \in r o v a i ́ a$, , Theodoret, Dial. III. p. 145 ; see Suicer, Thesaur. Vol. I. p. 109, Petavius, Theol. Dogm. ini. 4. 10, Vol. r. p. 200.
$\phi \hat{\omega} s$ oik $\hat{\omega} \nu]$ 'dwelling in light unapproachable.' In this sublime image God is represented, as it were, dwelling in an atmosphere of light, surrounded by glories which no created nature may ever approach, no mortal eye may ever contemplate; see below. Somewhat similar images occur in the O. T.; compare Psalm ciii. (civ.) 2, àvaßa入入ó $\mu \in \nu o s$ фôs
 au่านิ̂ ย̇สтเ. $\quad \delta \nu \in T \delta \in \nu$ oủ $\delta \in$ ls к. т. $\lambda$.] 'Whom no man ever saw or can see:' so Exodus xxxiii. 20, Deut. iv. 12, John i. 18, 1 John iv. 12, al. For reconciliation of these and similar declarations with texts such as

Matth. v. 8, Heb. xii. 14, see the excellent lecture of Bp. Pearson, de Invisibilitate Dei, Vol. I. p. 118 sq. (ed. Churton). The positions laid down by Pearson are 'Deus est invisibilis (1), oculo corporali per potentiam naturalem (2) oculo corporali in statu supernaturali (3) oculo intellectuali in statu naturali,' and (4) 'invisibilitas essentix divinæ non tollit claram visionem intellectualem in statu supernaturali :' Petav. Theol. Dogm. VII. 1.1 sq. Vol. I. p. 445 sq.
17. тois miovoíois к. $\tau$. $\lambda_{\text {. ] }}$ 'To the rich in this world;' 'multi divites Ephesi,' Beng. 'E $\nu \tau \hat{\varphi} \nu \hat{v} \nu$ aî̀vl must be closely joined with $\tau$ ois $\pi \lambda$., serving to make up with it one single idea; see notes on Eph. i. 15, where the rules for the omission of the article with the appended noun are briefly stated; see also Fritz. Rom. iii. 25, Vol. 1. p. 195, and Winer, ('r. § 20. 2, p. 123. The clause is perhaps added to suggest the contrast between the riches in this world and the true riches in the world to come ; калаิ

 expression appears to have a Hebraistic
 Schoettg. Hor. Vol. I. p. 883. For a powerful sermon on this and the two following verses, see Bp. Hall, Serin. vir. Vol. v. p. 102 sq. (Oxf. 1837).
$\dot{\eta} \lambda \pi t \kappa \epsilon \in \operatorname{ct]}$ ' 'to set hopes,' 'to have hoped and continued to hope;' see Winer, $G r$. § 41. 4. a, p. 315, Green, Gr. p. 21. On the construction of $\overline{\lambda \lambda \pi i} \delta \omega$ with $\dot{\epsilon} \pi i$, see notes on ch. iv. 10 . The attribute $\tau \hat{\varphi} \zeta \omega \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \iota$, added to $\Theta \epsilon \hat{\varphi}$, in Rec., though fairly supported |DEKL; al.; Syriac (both), Clarom., al. ; see Tisch.],



 ఢんฑ̂s.
does not seem genuine, but is perhaps only a reminiscence of ch. iv. 10.
$\pi \lambda$ ov́ $\frac{0 v}{}$ à $\delta \eta \lambda o ́ \tau \eta \tau t$ ] 'the uncertainty. of riches ;' an expression studiedly more forcible than $\grave{e} \pi l \tau \hat{\omega} \pi \lambda$ oú $\tau \omega \tau \bar{\varphi} \hat{\text { à }} \dot{\delta} \eta^{\prime}-$ $\lambda \omega ;$ compare Rom. vi. 4. The distinction between such expressions and $\dot{\eta}$
 denied by Fritz., Rom. Vol. 1. p. 368, is satisfactorily maintained by Winer, Gr. §34. 3, p. 211. In such cases the expression has a rhetorical coloring.
In the following words; instead of $\bar{\epsilon} \nu \tau \hat{\omega}$ $\Theta \epsilon \bar{\psi}$, Lachm. reads $\bar{\epsilon} \pi l \tau \bar{\varphi} \Theta$. with $\mathrm{AD}^{\prime}$ FG; al. (15) ; Orig. (mss.), Chrysost., Theoph. The external authority is of weight, but the probability of a conformation of the second clause to the first, and St. Paul's known love for prepositional variation, are important arguments in favor of the text, which is supported by $\mathrm{D}^{3} \mathrm{KLL}$; great majority of mss. ; Origen, Theodoret, Dam., al., and rightly adopted by the majority of recent editors. $\quad \epsilon i s$ à $\pi \delta \lambda a \nu \sigma \iota \nu$ ] 'for enjoyment,' 'to enjoy, not to place our heart and hopes in,' comp. ch. iv. 3, eis $\mu \in \tau \dot{d} \lambda \eta \psi \psi \nu$. 'Observa autem tacitam esse antithesin quum prodicat Deum omnibus affatim dare. Sensus enim est, etiamsi plenà rerum omnium copià abundamus, nos tamen nihil habere nisi ex solâ Dei benedictione,' Calvin.
18. à $\gamma a$ No $\in \rho \gamma \in \mathfrak{i} \nu]$ 'that they do good,' 'show kindness ;' infin. dependent on $\pi a p a ́ \gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda \lambda \epsilon$, enjoining on the positive side the use which the rich are to make
 only occurs here : the contracted à àas̃ovp. in Acts xiv. 17. The distinction of Bengel between the adjectives involved in
this and the following clause is scarcely exact, 'à yasds infert simul notionem beatitudinis (Mark x. 18, not.) калds connotat pulchritudinem.' The latter word is correctly defined, see Donalds. Cratyl. § 324 ; the former, as its probable derivation $\left(-\gamma a\right.$, cogn. with $\chi^{\text {a }}$, Donalds. ib. § 323, compare Benfey, Wurzellex. Vol. Ir. p. 64) seems to suggest, marks rather the idea of ' kindness, assistance;' comp. notes on Gal. v. 22.
$\epsilon \dot{v} \mu \in \tau \alpha \delta$. $\kappa$ o $\nu \omega \nu$. ] 'free in distributing, ready to communicate;' scarcely 'ready to distribute,' Auth. Ver. (comp. Syr.), as this seems rather to imply the qualitative termination -tкos: on the passive termination - tos (here used with some degree of laxity), see Donaldson, Cratyl. §255. Kлıעшעıкдs is not $\delta \mu \iota \lambda \eta \tau \iota \kappa o ́ s, \pi \rho o-$ oŋұvins, Chrys. and the Greek expositors ('facilis convictus,' Beza), but, as the context clearly shows, 'ready to impart to others,' see Gal. vi. 6. Both adjectives are ám. $\lambda \in \gamma o ́ \mu$. in the N. T. For a practical sermon on this and the preceding verses, see Beveridge, Sermon cxxvir. Vol. v. p. 426 (A.-C. Libr.
19. $\dot{\alpha} \pi o \uparrow \geqslant \sigma \alpha \nu \rho\{\zeta \circ \nu \tau \alpha s]$ 'laying up in store,' Auth. Ver. There is no necessity for departing from the regular meaning of the word; the rich are exhorted to take from ( $\dot{\alpha} \pi \delta)$ their own plenty, and by deroting it to the service of God and the relief of the poor to actually treasure it up as a good foundation for the future : in the words of Beveridge, ' their estates will not die with them, but they will have joy and comfort of them in the other world, and have cause to bless God for them to all eternity,' Serm. cxxvir. Vol. Iv. p. 439 (A.-C. Libr.).

Keep thy deposit，and avoid all false knowledge．


The preposition $\dot{\alpha} \pi \delta$ does not exactly mean＇seorsum，＇＇in longinquum＇（Ben－ gel），but seems to point to the source from which，and the process by which （＇seponendo thesaurum colligere，＇Winer， de Verb．Comp．IV．p．11），they are to make their ন̀nनavpoús ：compare Diodor．



 $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \delta \dot{\epsilon} \mu \in \lambda \lambda \delta \nu \tau \omega \nu$ à $\gamma a \hat{\omega} \omega \hat{\nu} \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \dot{\alpha} \pi \sigma \dot{\prime} \lambda a v \sigma \iota \nu$
 каl ăт $\rho \in \pi \tau \alpha$ ，Theodoret．© $\epsilon \mu$ е́ $\lambda, o s$ ，it need scarcely be said，is not here used for эงє́uc（compare Tobit iv．9），nor as equivalent in meaning to $\sigma \nu \nu$ ง̀ท่к （Ham－ mond），but retains its usual and proper meaning；a good foundation（contrast
 session which the rich are to store up for themselves ；compare ch．iii．13，$\beta a \uparrow \mu \delta \nu$
 not here，as Wiesinger remarks，any confusion，but only a brevity of expres－ sion which might have been more fully， but less forcibly expressed by àmo૭ŋбaup．
 le：）；the rich out of their riches are to lay up a treasure；this treasure is to be a $\epsilon \mu \epsilon ́ \lambda \lambda o s ~ \kappa \alpha \lambda$＇́s on which they may rest in order to lay hold on $\tau \hat{\eta} s$ oै $\nu \tau \omega s \zeta \omega \hat{\jmath} \mathrm{~s}$ ． The form $\mathfrak{\imath} \epsilon \mu \mu^{\prime} \lambda \imath o s$ is properly an adj． （compare Arist．Aves，1137，సิ $\mu \in \lambda$ ious $\lambda$ inous），but is commonly used in later writers as a subst．，e．g．Polyb．Mist．I． 40．9，comp．Thom．M．s．v．
$\tau \hat{\eta} s$ oै $\nu \tau \omega s \zeta \omega \hat{\eta} s]$＇the true life，＇＇that which is truly life：＇s celle qui mérite seule ce nom，parceque la perspective de la mort ne jette plus d＇ombre sur ses jours，＇ Reuss，Théol．Chrét．iv．22，Vol．I1．p． 252 ：that life in Christ（2 Timoth．i．1） which begins indeed here but is perfected
 $\chi^{\alpha} \nu \in t \tau \hat{\varphi}$ © $\Theta \hat{\varphi}$ ，Origen，in Joann．II．11，

Vol．Iv．p． 71 （ed．Bened．），see notes on ch．iv．8．On the meaning of $\zeta \omega \dot{\eta}$ ，see Trench，Synon．§ 27 ，and the decper and more comprehensive treatise of Olshau－ sen，Opuscula，p． 187 sq．The reading aiwviou［Rec．with $\mathrm{D}^{3} \mathrm{E}^{2} \mathrm{KL}$ ］is rejected even by Scholz，and has every appear－ ance of being a gloss．
 individualizing address is a suitable pre－ face to the concluding paragraph，which， as in 2 Cor．xiii．11，al．，contains the sum and substance of the Ep．，and brings again into view the salient points of the apostle＇s previous warnings and exhor－ tations．Tウ̀ $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha$ へ̀ウ $\dot{\prime} \kappa \in \nu$ ］＇the de－ posit；＇only（ $\alpha$ ）here，and（ $\beta$ ） 2 Tim．i．
 $\lambda \alpha \dot{\xi} \alpha$, and $(\gamma) 2$ Tim．i．14，т $\grave{\nu} \nu \kappa \lambda \grave{\eta} \nu$
 these three passages the exact reference of $\pi \alpha \rho a \underset{\text { ஷि }}{\kappa \eta}$ is somewhat doubtful．It seems highly probable that the meaning in all three passages will be fundamentally the same，but it is not necessary to ham－ per ourselves with the assumption that in all three passages it is exactly the same，the unnccessary assumption which interferes with De Wette＇s otherwise able analysis．What is this approximately common meaning？Clearly not either ＇his soul，＇ 1 Pet．iv．19，Beng．on $(\beta)$ ， or his＇soul＇s salvation，＇for this interpre－ tation，though plausible in $(\beta)$ ，would by no means be suitable either in（ $\alpha$ ）or $(\gamma)$ ；
 odoret，$h$ ．$l$ ．，for this would in effect in－ troduce a tautology in $(\gamma)$ ．Not improb－ ably，as De W．，Huther，al．，＇the minis－ terial office，＇i．e．＇the apostolic office＇ in（ $\alpha$ ），＇the office of an evangelist＇in（ $\beta$ ） and $(\gamma)$ ；there is，however，this objec－ tion，that though not unsuitable in $(\beta)$ it does not either here or in（ $\gamma$ ）present any direct－opposition to what follows，$B \in \beta \eta^{-}$－入ous кеуофшขías каl à $\nu \tau \iota ง$ ．к．т．$\lambda$ ．On

## 

the whole then, the gloss of Chrysost. on $(\beta), \dot{\eta} \pi i \sigma \tau i s, \tau \delta \kappa \dot{\eta} \rho \cup \gamma \mu \alpha$ (comp. Theoph. I, (Ecum. I.), or rather, more generally, 'the doctrine delivered (to Timothy) to preach,' 'Catholicæ fidei talentum,' Vincent. Lirin. (Common. cap. 22, ed. Oxf. 1841), seems best to preserve the opposition here and to harmonize with the context in $(\gamma)$, while with a slight expansion it may also be applied to $(\boldsymbol{\beta})$; see notes in loc. Compare 1 Tim. i. 18 and 2 Tim. ii. 2 , both of which, especially the former, seem satisfactorily to confirm this interpretation. On $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \hat{\eta} \dot{\gamma} \kappa \eta$ and $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha-$ $\kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \uparrow$ ท́кŋ (Rec.,- but with most insufficient authority), the latter of which is apparently the more idiomatic form, see Lobeck, Phryn. p. 312, and compare the numerous examples in Wetstein in loc.
$\left.\epsilon^{\prime} \kappa \tau \rho \in \pi \delta \mu \in \nu \circ s\right\}_{\text {' 'avoiding,' Authoriz. }}$ Ver., 'devitans,' Vulg., Clarom: ; the middle voice, especially with an accus. objecti, being sometimes suitably rendered by a word of different meaning to that conveyed by the act. voice : comp. Winer, Gr. § 38. 2, p. 226.
$\kappa \in \nu о \phi \omega \nu\{\alpha s]$ 'babblings,' 'empty-talk. ings,' 'vanos sine mente sonos,' Raphel, - only here and 2 Timothy ii. 16, and scarcely different in meaning from $\mu \alpha$ тauo久oyía, 1 Tim. i. 6 ; contrast James iv. 3, and comparo Deyling, Obs. Vol. 1v. 2, p. 642. On $\beta \in \beta$ й $\lambda$ ous (which as the omission of the article shows belongs also to $\dot{\alpha} \nu \tau t \hat{N}$ ' $\sigma \in \epsilon s$ ) and the prefixed article, comp. notes on ch. iv. 7.
$\left.\alpha \nu \tau i \tau \in \in \in \iota s \kappa \cdot \tau . \lambda_{0}\right]$ 'oppositions of the falsely-named Knowledge,' of the Knowledge which falsely arrogates to itself that name,' ' non enim vera scientia esse potest quæ veritati contraria cst,' Est.
 [contorsiones, oppositiones] Syr., it is somewhat difficult to ascertain. Baur (Pastorallor. p. 26 sq.), for obvious rea-
sons, presses the special allusion to the Marcionite oppositions between the law and the Gospel (see Tertull. Marc. 1. 19), but has been ably answered by Wieseler, Chronol. p. 304. Chrysostom and Theophyl. (compare Ecum.) refer it to personal controversies and to objections against the Gospel: aî où $\delta$ è à àoкрive $\sigma$ Nat $\chi$ pク̀ ; this, however, is scarcely sufficiently general. The language might be thought at first sight to point to something specific (compare Huther) ; when, however, we observe that $\kappa \in \nu o \phi \omega \nu$ ias and
 single article, it seems difficult to maintain a more definite meaning in the latter word than the former. These д̀ $\nu \tau \mathfrak{\omega}$ érets, then, are generally the positions and teachings of the false-knowledge which arrayed themselves against the doctrine committed to Timothy,- $\tau$ dेs èvavrias Ń̦ $\sigma \in \epsilon s$, Coray ; so even De Wette.
The use of the peculiar term $\gamma \nu \omega \bar{\omega}$,s seems to show that it was becoming the appellation of that false and addititious teaching which, taking its rise from a Jewish or Cabbalistic philosophy (Col. ii. 8), already bore within it the seeds of subsequent heresies, and was preparing the way for the definite gnosticism of a later century: compare Chrysost. and especially Theod. in loc., and see notes on ch. i. 4.
21. $\epsilon \pi \alpha \gamma \gamma \in \lambda \lambda \delta \mu \in \nu 0$ । ' making $a$ profession of;' 'pro se ferentes,' Beza; see notes on chap. ii. 10.
$\eta \sigma \tau$ ó $\eta \boldsymbol{\eta} \alpha \nu$ ] ' missed their aim;' Wiesinger here urges most fairly that it is perfectly incredible that any forger in the second century should have applied so mild an expression to followers of the Marcionite Gnosis. On the à $\sigma \tau 0 \chi$ é $\omega$ see notes on ch. i. 6 , and for the use of $\pi \in \rho \rho^{\prime}$, see notes on ch. i. 19.
$\mu \in \tau \grave{\alpha} \sigma \circ \hat{v} \mid$ So Tisch. with DEKL; nearly all mss. ; majority of $\mathrm{Vv}_{0}$, and many Ff . The
 $\pi i \sigma \tau \iota \nu \eta \dot{\sigma} \tau \dot{\chi} \chi \eta \sigma a \nu$.
Benedicition. 'H $\chi$ ápıs $\mu \epsilon \tau a ̀ ~ \sigma o v ̂ . ~$
plural $\dot{\delta} \mu \hat{\omega} y$ is adopted by Lachm. with AFG; 17 ; Boern., Copt., al.,-but is very probably a correction derived from 2 Tim. v. 22, or Tit. iii. 15 ; at any rate, even if $\dot{\tilde{j}} \mu \hat{\nu} \nu$ be retained, no stress can safely be laid on the plural as implying that the Epistle was addressed to the

Church as well as to Timothy. All that could be said would be that St. Paul sent his benediction to the Church in and with that to its Bishop. Huther somewhat singularly maintains $\sigma o v$ in his critical notes, and, as it would seem, $\dot{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ in his commentary.

## Note on I Tim. iii. 16.

The results of my examination of the Cod. Alex. may be thus briefly stated. On inspecting the disputed word there appeared (a) a coarse line over, and a rude dot within the O , in black ink; (b) a faint line across O in ink of the same color as the adjacent letters. It was clear that (a) had no claim on attention, except as being possibly a rude retouching of $(b)$ : the latter demanded careful examination. After inspection with a strong lens it seemed more than probable that Wetstein's opinion (Prolegom. Vol. 1. p. 22) was correct. Careful measurement showed that the first $\epsilon$ of $\epsilon \dot{\sigma} \epsilon^{\prime} \beta \in t a v$, ch. vi. 3, on the other side of the page, was exactly opposite, the circular portion of the two letters nearly entirely coinciding, and the thickened extremity of the sagitta of $\epsilon$ being behind what had seemed a ragged portion of the left-hand imer edge of 0 . It remained only to prove the identity of this sagitta with the seeming line across the $\mathbf{O}$. This with the kind assistance of Mr. Hamilton, of the Brit. Museum, was thus effected. While one of us held up the page to the light and viewed the $O$ through the lens, the other brought the point of an instrument (without of course touching the MS.) so near to the extremity of the sagitta of the $\epsilon$ as to make a point of shade visible to the observer on the other side. When the point of the instrument was drawn over the sagitta of the $\epsilon$, the point of shade was seen to exactly trace out the suspected diameter of the O . It would thus seem certain that $(b)$ is no part of $O$, and that the reading of $A$ is $8 s$.

## THE SECOND EPISTLE T0 TIUOTHY.

## INTRODUCTION.

Tris Second Epistle to his faithful friend and follower was written by the apostle during his second imprisonment at Rome (see notes on ch. iv. 12, and comp. ch. i. 18), and, as the inspired writer's own expressions fully justify our asserting (chap. iv. 6), but a very short time before his martyrdom, and in the interval between the 'actio prima' (see notes on ch. iv. 16) and its mournful issue ; comp. Euseb. Hist. Eccl. II. 22.

It would thus have been written about the year A. D. 67 or perhaps A. D. 68 , i. e. the last but one, or last year of the reign of Nero, which tradition (Euseb. Chron. ann. 70 A. D.; Jerome, Catal. Scrupt. cap. 5, p. 35, ed. Fabricius), apparently with some degree of plausibility, fixes upon as the period of the apostle's martyrdom ; see Conybeare and Howson, St. Paul, Vol. Ir. p. 596, note (ed. 2), and compare Pearson, Annal. Paul. Vol. 1. p. 396 (ed. Churton).

Where Timothy was at this time cannot very readily be clecided, as some references in the Epistle (ch. i. 15 sq. compared with iv. 19, ch. ii. 17, al.) seem to harmonize with the not unnatural supposition that he was at Ephesus, while others (ch. iv. 12, 20) have been thought to imply the contrary; comp. notes on ch. iv. 12. On the whole the arguments derived from the generally similar terms in which the present tenets (comp. ii. 16 with 1 Tím. vi. 20 , and ch. ii. 23 with 1 Tim. vi. 4), future developments (comp. ch. iii. 1,5 with 1 Tim. iv. 1 sq.), and even names (comp. ch. ii. 17 with 1 Tim. i. 20) of the false teachers are characterized in the two Epistles, seem to outweigh those deduced from the topographical notices, and to render it slightly more probable that, at the time when the Second Epistle was written, Timothy was conceived by the apostle to be at the scene of his appointed labors ( $1 \mathrm{Tim} . \mathrm{i} .3$ ), and as either actually at Ephesus or visiting some of the dependant churches in its immediate neighborhood : see Conybeare and Howson, St. Paul, Vol. ri. p. 582, note (ed. 2).

The apostle's principal purpose in writing the Epistle was to nerve and sustain Timothy amid the now deepening trials and persecutions of the

Church from without (ch. i. 8, ii. 3,12 , iii. 12, iv. 5 ), and to prepare and forewarn him against the still sadder trials from threatening heresies and apostasies from within (ch. iii. 1 sq .). The secondary purpose was the earnest desire of the apostle, forlorn as he then was (ch. iv. 16), and deserted as he was by all save the faithful Luke (ch. iv. 11), to see once more his true son in the faith (ch. iv. 9, 21), and to sustain him not by his written words only, but by the practical teaching of his personal example. In no Epistle does the true, loving, undaunted, and trustful heart of the great apostle speak in more consolatory yet more moving accents : in no portion of his writings is there a loftier tone of Christian courage than that which pervades these, so to speak, dying words; nowhere a holier rapture than that with which the reward and crown of faithful labor is contemplated as now exceeding nigh at hand.

The question of the genuineness and authenticity stands in connection with that of the First Epistle. This only may be added, that if the general tone of this Epistle tends to make us feel convinced that it could have been written by no hand save that of St. Paul, its perfect identity of language with that of the First Epistle and the Epistle to Titus involves a further evidence of the genuineness and authenticity of those Epistles which it thus resembles, and with which it stands thus closely connected.

# TIIE SECOND EPISTLE T0 TIMOTHY． 

## CHAPTERI．

Apostolic address and salu－ tation．




 the faith that is in thee and thy family．Stir up thy gift．



1．$\delta$ เà $શ \in \lambda \dot{n} \mu a \tau \cos \Theta \in o \hat{v}$ ］＇through the will of God：＇＇apostolatum suum vo－ luntati et electioni Dei adseribit，non suis meritis，＇Est．；so 1 Cor．i．1， 2 Cor．i．1， Eph．i． 1 （where see notes），Col．i．1．In the former Epistle the apostle terms him－
 haps thus slightly enhancing the author－ ity of his commission，see notes；here， possibly on account of the following кaтá， he reverts to his usual formuta． $\kappa \alpha \tau^{\prime} \quad \dot{e} \pi \alpha, \gamma \gamma \in \lambda i i^{\alpha} \nu$ must be joined，as the omission of the article clearly decides， not with $\delta \dot{\alpha}$ ̀̀ $\uparrow \in \lambda \tilde{\eta} \mu a \tau o s$, but with $\grave{a} \pi \delta \sigma \tau \sigma-$ خos（comp．Tit．i．1）；the prep．karà de－ noting the object and intention of the ap． pointment，＇to further，to make known the promise of eternal life，＇à áббто入óv


 see Tit．i．1，кatà $\pi i \sigma \tau v \nu$ ，and compare

Winer，Gr．§ 49．d，p．358，and notes on 1 Tim．vi．3．On the expression èmarye入．乡 $\omega \mathrm{h} \mathrm{s}$ ，and the nature of the genitival re－ lation，see notes on 1 Tim．iv． 8.
2．д̀ $\gamma a \pi \eta \tau \hat{\omega} \tau \bar{\epsilon} \kappa \nu \omega]^{\prime}$＇$(m y)$ beloved child：＇so in 1 Cor．iv．17，but in 1 Tim．
 quidem（ $\gamma \nu \eta \sigma$ ．）ad Timothei commenda－ tionem et laudem pertinet；hoc vero Pauli in illum benevolentiam et charita－ tem declarat，quod ipsum tamen，ut mo－ net Chrysost．，in ejus laudem recidit，＇ Justiniani．It is strange indeed in Mack （comp．Alf．）here to find an insinuation that Timothy did not now deserve the former title．Scarcely less precarious is it（with Alf．）to assert that there is more of love and less of confidence in this Fpistle ；see ver．5．On the construction see notes on 1 Tim．i． 2.
 Eph．i． 2 ；compare also on Gial．i．3，and

## 

on 1 Tim. i. 2. On the scriptural meaning of $\chi \alpha$ dos see the brief but satisfactory observations of Waterland, Euch. ch. x. Vol. iv. p. 666 sq.
3. $\chi$ ápเข $\check{\epsilon} \chi \omega]$ ' $I$ give thanks;' more commonly eঠ̉ $\chi a \rho \iota \sigma \tau \hat{\omega}$, but see 1 Tim. i. 12, and Philem. 7 (Tisch.). The construction of this verse is not perfectly clear. The usual connection $\chi$ d́pıv é $\chi \omega$ $\dot{\omega} \kappa \kappa . \tau_{0} \lambda$., in which $\dot{\omega}$ s is taken for öt (Vulg., Chrys.), or quuniam (Leo), independently of its exegetical difficulties, for surely neither the prayers themselves, nor the repeated mention of Timothy in them (Leo), could form a sufficient reason for the apostle's returning thanks to God,-is open to the grammatical ohjections that $\omega s$ could scarcely thus be used for ötı (see Klotz, Devar. Vol. ir. p. 765, comp. Ellendt, Lex. Soph. Vol. II. p. 1002), and that the causal sense is not found in St. Paul's Epistles (see Meyer on Gal. vi. 10). Less tenable is the modal ('how unceasing,' Alf.), and still less so is the temporal meaning, 'quoties tui recordor,' Calvin, Conyb. (comp. Klotz, Vol. II. p. 759), and least of all so the adverbial meaning assigned by Mack, 'recht unablässig.' In spite then of the number of intervening words ( De W.), it. scems most correct, as well as most simple, to retain the usual meaning of $\dot{\omega}$ ('as,' Germ. 'du,' scil. 'as it happens I have '), to refer $\chi \alpha{ }^{\alpha} \rho เ \nu$ é $\chi \chi \omega$ to víóuv. $\lambda a \beta \omega \nu$, ver. 5 , and to regard $\dot{\omega}$ dंSıd́ $\lambda$. к. т. $\lambda$. as marking the state of feelings, the mental circumstances, as it were, under which the apostle expresses his thanks ; 'I thank God....as thou art ever uppermost in my thoughts and prayers... when thus put in remembrance,' etc. This seems also best to harmonize with the position of the tertiary predicate, àdıá $\lambda \epsilon \iota \pi \tau o \nu$; see below. Under any circumstances, it seems impossible with Coray to suppose an ellipsis of kal $\mu$ ap-
 ferent. On $\omega s$, compare notes on Gal . vi. $10 . \quad$ à $\pi \delta \pi \rho \circ \gamma \delta \nu \omega \nu]$ 'from ( $m y$ ) forefuthers,' ' with the feelings and principles inherited and derised from them,' - not 'as my fathers have done before me,' Waterland, Serm. ini. Vol. v. p. 454 ; see Winer, Gr. § 51. b, p. 333. These were not remote (IIamm.), but more immediate (compare 1 Tim. v. 4) progenitors, from whom the apostle had received that fundamental religious knowledre which was common both to Judaism and Christianity; comp. Acts xxii. 3, xxiv. $14 . \quad \dot{\epsilon} \nu \kappa \alpha \dot{\sim} \alpha \rho \bar{\alpha}$ $\sigma \nu \nu \in I \delta$.$] 'in a pure conscience;' as the$ sort of spiritual sphere in which the $\lambda \alpha-$ т $\boldsymbol{\prime}$ éa was offered; sce Winer, Grr. § 48. a, p. 346. On кâ. $\sigma \nu \nu \in เ \delta$. see notes on 1 Tim. i. 5.
$\dot{\omega} s \dot{\alpha} \delta \iota \dot{\alpha} \lambda \in \iota \pi \tau \circ \nu]$ 'as unceusing, unintermitted, is,' etc., not 'unintermitted as is,' etc., Pcile; the tertiary predicate must not be obscured. in translation: see Donalds. Cratyl. $\$$ 301, ib. Gr. Gr. § 489 sq.
$\nu v \kappa \tau \delta s \kappa \alpha\}$ ض̀ $\mu \epsilon$ fas must not be
 and still less, on account of the absence of the article, with $\delta \in \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma \in \sigma^{\prime} \nu \mu o \nu$ (Syr.), but with á $\delta a \dot{a} \lambda$. É $\chi \omega$, which these words alike explain and enhance. On the expression sce notes on 1 Tim. v. 5 .
4. $\grave{\epsilon} \pi เ \pi \circ \hat{N} \hat{\omega} \nu$ ] 'longing;' part. dependant on ${ }^{\epsilon} \chi \omega \mu \mu \nu \dot{\beta} \alpha \nu$, expressing the fceling that existed previously to, or contemporaneous with that action (compare Jelf, Gr. § 685), and connected with the final clause $\tilde{i}^{\nu} \alpha a \pi \lambda \eta \rho \omega i \frac{\omega}{\omega}$. The following Prarticipial clause, $\mu \in \mu \nu \eta \mu \in ́ \nu o s ~ к . \tau . \lambda$. ('memor tuarum lachrymarum,' Vulg., Clarom.), does not refer to $\chi$ d́piv E € $\chi \omega$, as the meaningr of iva would thus be wholly obscured, but further illustrates and explains $\grave{e} \pi เ \pi 0 \uparrow \hat{\omega} \nu$, to, which it is appended with a faint causal force ; 'longing to see thee, in remembrance of (as I remem-



5. $\lambda \alpha \beta \omega \nu$ ] So Lachm. with ACEG; al. 3. Tisch. reads $\lambda \alpha \mu \beta \alpha \nu \omega \nu$ with DEJK: nearly all mss.; Chrys., Theod., al. The latter, however, seems to have arisen from a couformation to the pres. $\grave{\epsilon} \pi \iota \pi o \uparrow ิ \omega \bar{\nu}$.
ber) thy tears, in order that I may,' etc. The $\dot{\epsilon} \pi l$ in $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \pi 0 \uparrow ิ \omega \nu$ might at first sight seem to be intensive,- 'vehementer optans,' Just., 'greatly desiring,' Auth. Version, - both here and in Rom. i. 11, 1 Thess. iii. 6. As; however, the simple form noה̀ é $\omega$ is not used in the N. T., and as this intensive force cannot by any means be certainly substantiated in other authors, è $\pi i$ will be more correctly taken as marking the direction (Rost u. Palm, Lex. s. v. $\frac{e}{} \pi i$, c, b.) of the $\pi$ ózos. comp. $^{\text {. }}$
 sce esp. the good note of Fritz. Rom. Vol. 1. p. 31.
$\sigma u v \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \delta \alpha \kappa \rho \dot{v} \omega \nu$ ] 'the tears which thou sheddest,' - probably at parting ; єi-

 $\tau \eta े s ~ \tau \iota \tau ง ิ \eta ิ s ~ \dot{\alpha} \pi \sigma \sigma \pi \omega ́ \mu \in \nu o \nu$, Chrysost. Coray compares the case of the $\pi \rho \epsilon \sigma \beta \dot{\tau} \tau \epsilon \rho o l$ at Ephesus, Acts xx. 37 ; sue al=o Wicseler, Chronol. p. 463.
5. $\left.\dot{v} \pi \delta^{\prime} \mu \nu \eta \sigma \iota \nu \lambda \alpha \beta \omega \nu\right]$ 'being put in remembrance:' literally, 'having received reminding,' not, with a neglect of tense, 'dum in mem. revoco,' Leo (who reads $\lambda \alpha \beta \dot{\omega} \nu)$. The assertion of Bengel, founded on the distinction of Ammonius


 St. Paul might have been reminded of Timothy's faith by some 'externa occasio aut nuncius,' is not to be dismissed with Huther's summary ' unbegrundet ; ' it is plausible, harmonizes with the tense, and lexically considered, is very satisfactory ; compare 2 Pet. i. 13 , iii. 1 , the
only other passages in the N . T. where the word occurs. The intrans meaning is fully detensible ( $\mu \nu \dot{\eta} \mu \eta \nu$, кal iठิıт $\omega \kappa \bar{\omega} s$ eimeî̀ úm $\delta \mu \nu \eta \sigma L \nu$, Eustath. Ill. xxili. p. 1440, see also Polyb. Hist. r. 1. 2, iII. 31. 6 ), and 2 Pet. i. $9, \lambda \hat{\eta} \lambda \eta \nu \lambda \alpha \beta \dot{\omega} \nu$, is certainly analogous, still, on the whole the transitive meaning seems preferable; compare Eph. i. 15, where the construction is similar.
$\tau \bar{\eta} s \in \stackrel{y}{\varepsilon} \nu$ Gol к. т. 入.] 'the unfeigned faith that is (not 'was,' Alf.) in thee,' - more exactly, 'quæ est in te non ficta,' Vulg., similar Gothic ; ohject which called forth the apostle's thankfulness. On àvuтóкрıтos, see notes on 1 Tim. i. 5.
$\pi \rho \hat{\omega} \tau o \nu]$ 'first;' not for $\tau \grave{\partial} \pi \rho \hat{\omega} \tau o \nu$, nor again for $\pi \rho o ́ t \in p o \nu$ ('prius quam in te,' Leo), hut simply 'first:' the indwelling of faith in Timothy's family first becran in the case of Lois. The relative intes hiere seems used, not as often, with an explanatory; but with a specifying, and, what may be termed, a differentiating force,-' 'this particular àдvтóкр. тí tis, no other, dwelt first,' etc. ; see notes on Gal. iv. 24, and comp Jelf, Gr. $\$ 816$. $\mu \dot{\alpha} \mu \mu \eta$ ] 'grandmother.' The Atticists condemn this form, the correct expres= sion beiug т $\mathfrak{\prime} \uparrow \uparrow \eta$ ( not $\tau i \tau \uparrow \eta$ ), Lobeck, Phryn. p. 134, Thom. Mag. s. v. тín $\eta$. The mother, Eunice, (possibly the daughter of Lois, ) is alluded to, Acts xvi. 1.
 'et in te est.' De Wette seems inclined to favor the supplement of Grot., al., Eขoкк $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \sigma$, , on the hypothesis that Timothy had become weak in faith (ver. 13, chap. iii. 14),-an hypothesis; which

## 

though advocated by Alf. throughout this Epistle, is certainly precarious, and, it seems reasonable to add, improbable. The transition to exhortation does not at all favor such a supposition ; 'imo quo certius Paulus de Timothei fide persuasus erat, co majorem habebat causam adhortandi ut aleret $\tau \grave{\partial} \chi \chi \dot{\alpha} \iota \sigma \mu a$ тoù $\Theta \epsilon o \hat{v}$, quo gauderet,' Leo.
6. $\delta$ i $h \nu \alpha i \tau\{\alpha \nu]$ 'For which cause,'
 Theophyl.; $\tau \alpha u ̂ \tau \alpha ~ \pi \epsilon \rho \grave{\imath}$ бov $\pi \in \pi \epsilon \epsilon \sigma \mu \epsilon ́ v o s$ таракалิิ к. т. $\lambda$., Theod., comp. notes on ver. 12: as the apostle knew that this faith was in Timothy, he reminds him ('in memoriam redigit,' Just., compare 1 Cor. iv. 17) to exhibit it in action. It is by no means improbable that this ${ }^{2} \nu \alpha^{\prime}-$ $\mu \nu \eta \sigma$ is was suggested by a knowledge of the grief, and possible despondency, into which Timothy might have sunk at the absence, trials, and imprisonment of his spiritual father in the fiith ; ${ }^{\circ} p \alpha \pi \bar{\omega} s \delta \epsilon_{i ́ k}$
 катทфеía, Chrys. This we may reasonably assume, but to believe that this 'dear child ' of the apostle was showing signs of 'backwardness and timidity ' (Alf., Prol. p. 100) in his ministerial work, needs far more proof than has yet been adduced.
$\dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha \zeta \omega \pi v \rho \in i \nu]$ ' to kindle up,' $\grave{\alpha} \in l$ s'̃̄ $\sigma \alpha \nu$

 tes] Syr. ; sce Suicer, Thesaur. s. v. Vol. 1. p. 265. There is no lexical necessity for pressing the meaning of this word, 'sopitos ignes suscitare,' Grot., al. Indeed it may be further said that $\alpha \nu a \zeta \omega$ -
 not here necessarily 'resuscitare,' Vulg., 'wieder anfachen,' Huth., but rather ' $e x$ suscitare,' Beza, 'anzufachen,' 1)e W. ., the force of $\dot{\alpha} \nu \dot{\alpha}$ being up, upwurds, e. g.
 Win., de Verb. Comip. 11I. p. 1, note, Rost
u. Palm, Lex. s. v. à $\nu$ á, E. 1 ; comp. Plutarch, Pomp. 41, $\alpha$ 认ुN เs à $\nu a \zeta \omega \pi v \rho o u ̂ \nu \tau a$ каi $\pi$ арабкєva̧ópevov. The simple form Swrupeîv is 'to kindle to flame ' ( $\tau$ oùs ăvspakas фuбâv, Suidas), the compound àpa ${ }^{( } \omega \pi v \rho \in i \nu$ is either $(a)$ to 'rekindle,' and in a metaphorical sense 'revivify,'
 $\tau \eta\rangle \nu \delta \epsilon \xi \nmid \alpha \dot{\nu} \nu$ (Jeroboam's hand), compare
 ка. à $\nu \in\{\omega \pi v \rho o v ́ \mu \eta \nu$; or (b) as here, 'to
 ' to fan into a flame,' without, however, involving any necessary reference to a previous state of higher ardor or of fuller glow: compare Marc. Anton. vir. 2,
 and apparently Plato, Republ. vir. $52 \overline{1}$
 has been before said, it is not wholly improbable that Timothy might now have been in a state of ádupuía, but this inference rests more on the general fact of the à $\nu \alpha \dot{\alpha} \mu \nu \eta \sigma \iota s$ than on a meaning of the isolated word. Numerous examples of the use of $\zeta \omega \pi$. and $\dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha \zeta \omega \pi$. will be found in Wetstein in loc., Krebs, Obs. p. 360, Loesner, Obs. p. 412 ; sce also Pierson, 110er. p. $170 . \quad \tau \dot{\delta} \chi \alpha ́ \rho เ \sigma \mu a\}$ 'the gift, the charism,' - not the Holy Spirit generally, тウ̀ $\chi$ đ́́pıv тồ Пขє́́uatos, Theodoret, and apparently Waterland, Serm. xxi. Vol. v. p. 641 (whose clear remarks, however, on the concurence of our spirit with the Holy Spirit are not the less worthy of attention), - but the special gift of it in reference to Timothy's duties as a bishop and evangelist, eis
 $\lambda a \tau \rho \epsilon$ íà ätaбav. Chrysostom : compare Hooker, Eccl. Pol. v. 77. 5.
 etc. ; the hands were the medium by which the gift of the Holy Spirit was imparted. On the $\dot{\epsilon} \pi i \hat{\imath} \epsilon \sigma \iota s \quad \chi \in เ \rho \omega \hat{\nu}$, see notes on 1 Tim. iv. 14, where it is mentioned that

 каі̀ $\sigma \omega \phi \rho о \nu \iota \sigma \mu$ и̂.

Do not then shrink from afflictions, for the sake of Him who made death pow-
 erless. I am His preacher, and know that He will keep my deposit. Guard thine.
the presbytery joined with the apostle in the performance of the solemn act.
7. $\Pi \nu \in \hat{v} \mu \alpha \delta \in \iota \lambda\{\alpha s]$ ' the spirit of

 бta̧'ต́ $\mu$ EÑa, Chrys. ; not 'a spirit, a natural and infused character,' Pcile : sce notes on Eph. i. 17, and on Gal. vi. 1. By comparing those two notes it will be seen that in such cases as the present, where the $\pi \nu \in \hat{\nu} \mu \alpha$ is mentioned in connection with $\delta, \delta \delta$ vat $\kappa . \tau . \lambda$. , it is better to refer it directly to the personal Holy Spirit and the abstract genitive to His specific $\chi^{\alpha} \rho \iota \sigma \mu \alpha$. Where, however, as in I Cor. iv. 21, Gal. l. c. the connection is different, the $\pi \nu \in \hat{\nu} \mu a$ may be referred immediately to the human spirit (compare Olshausen, Opusc. p. 154), though even then ultimately to the Holy Spirit as the inworking power. In such formulæ, then, whether it be the human spirit as wrought on by the Holy Spirit, or the Holy Spirit as working on the human spirit, will be best deduced from the context: with the present passage compare Rom. viii. 15, Gal. iv. 6. On the omission of the article with $\pi \nu \in \hat{\nu} \mu a$, see notes on Gulatuins v. 5. $\sigma \omega \phi \rho \circ \nu \iota \sigma \mu \circ \hat{v}]$ 'self-control :'
 tatis,' Vulg., Clarom. ; an äm. $\lambda \in \gamma \delta \mu$. in N. T., but compare Tit. ii. 4. इwфpovooubs, as its termination suggests (Donalds. Cratyl. § 253. Buttm. Gr. § 119. 7, see examples, Lobeck, Phryn. p. 511), has usually a transitive force, e. g. Plutarch, Cut. Maj. 5, द̇ $\pi l$ $\sigma \omega \phi p o \nu ı \sigma \mu \bar{\omega} \tau \bar{\omega} \nu$ ä̀ $\lambda \omega \nu$, compare Joseph. Antiq. xvir. 9. 2, Bell. II. 1. 3 ; as, however, both the substantives with which it is connected
are abstract and intransitive, and as the usual meaning of nouns in - $\mu$ os ('action proceeding from the subject') is subject to some moditications (e.g. Хp $\eta \sigma \mu$ ós, compare Buttm. l. c.), it seems on the whole best, with De Wette, Wiesinger, al., to give it either a purely intransitive (Plutarch, Qucest. Convio. Viri. 3, $\sigma \omega$ фpovio $\mu$ ois tivil औो $\mu \in \tau a v o i a u s)$ or perhaps rather reflexive reference ; $\downarrow \nu \alpha \sigma \omega \phi \rho o \nu i \sigma \omega-$ $\mu \in \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \bar{\epsilon} \nu \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\imath} \nu$ кเข Th́n àrakial, Theodoret, Chrysostom 2; comp. Suicer, Thestaur. s. v. Vol. 11. p, 1224, Neander, Planting, Vol. 1. p. 486 (Bohn).
8. $\mu \dot{\eta}$ о $\overline{\text { un к. т. } \lambda \text {.] Exhortation, im- }}$ mediately dependant on the foregoing verse; ' as God has thus given us the spirit of power, love, and self-control, do not therefore be ashamed of testifying about our Lord.' On the connection of ai $\sigma \chi$ v́vouat and similar verbs with the accusative, see Beruhardy, Synt. III. 19, p. 113, Jelf, Gr. § 550 . The compound form $\epsilon \pi \alpha \iota \sigma \chi$. [ $\epsilon \pi t$ probably marks the imaginary point of application, that on which the feeling is based, Rost u. Palm, Lex. s. v. c. 3] is frequently thus used in the N. T., both with persons (Mark viii. 38 , Luke ix. 26), and with things (ch. i. 16, Rom. i. 16), but not so the simple form. Observe the aor. subjunctive with $\mu$ ', ' ne te pudeat unquam,' Leo ; Timothy hud as yet evinced no such feeling; see Winer, Gr. §56. 1, p. 445. Tov Kvp[ov] 'of the Lord,' i. e. 'about the Lord,' gen. objecti; see Winer, Gr. § 30. 1, p. 168, and esp Krüger, Sprachl. §47.7.1 sq. The subject of this testimony was not merely the sufferings and crucifixion of Christ (Chrysost. und the




Greek commentt.), but generally 'omnis predicatio vel confessio quæ de Christo fit apud homines,' Est. ; compare Acts i. 8, ё $\sigma \epsilon \sigma$ ง่є́ $\mu$ оь $\mu \alpha ́ \rho \tau v \rho \epsilon s$. Bengel remarks on the rareness of the formula, $\delta \mathrm{K} \dot{\rho} \rho$. $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$, in St. Paul, without 'I. X. ; add, however, 1 Tim. i. 14 : sce also Heb. vii. 14 , but not 2 Pet. iii. 15 , where the reference appears to the Father.
$\left.\delta \epsilon ́ \sigma \mu \iota \frac{\nu}{\alpha} \dot{v} \tau o \hat{\imath}\right]$ 'His prisoner,' i.e. whom He has made a prisoner, gen. auctoris ; sce notes on Eph. iii. 1, and also Harless, in loc, p. 273. 'Ne graveris vocari discipulus Pauli hominis captivi,' Est., Ecum. $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha} \sigma v \nu-$ $\kappa \alpha \kappa о \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha}$ そ $\sigma$ о $\nu \kappa$ к. т. $\lambda$.] 'but (on thie contrary) join with me in suffering ills for the Gospel;' $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha}$ (as usual after negatives, Donalds. Crutyl. § 201) marking the full opposition between this clause and the words immediately preceding (comp. Kilotz, Devar. Vol. 11. p. 2, 3), 'don't be ashamed of me, but rather suffer with me.' It is thus perhaps better with Lachm. to retain the comma after $\dot{\eta} \mu \omega \hat{\nu}$. The preposition $\sigma \dot{v} \nu$ must be re-
 as this would involve a very unusual and unnecessary prosopopœia ( $\pi \alpha ́ \nu$ тas toùs тои̂ є̀̀arर. кйрикаs каl цúбтas, Theoph. 2), but to $\mu$ ot supplied from the preceding é $\mu \epsilon$. The dat. evar $\boldsymbol{e}_{\epsilon \lambda \text {. is then either }}$ the dat. of reference to (sce notes on Gal. i. 22 ; comp. the fuller expression Phil.
 below, ch. ii. 9), or more probably and more simply the dat. commodi, $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \grave{\epsilon} \rho$ रov̂ є $\dot{\jmath} \alpha \gamma \gamma$. $\pi \dot{\alpha} \sigma \chi \in \iota \nu$, Chrys., Theoph. I.
$\kappa \alpha \tau$ aे $\delta \dot{v} \nu a \mu \iota \nu]$ 'in' arcordance with, correspondingly to that סúvauss which God has displayed towards $u$ in our calling and salvation,' ver. 9 seq. (Wicsing.), not with any reference to the spiritual $\delta \dot{v} v a \mu s$ infused in us, ver. 7 (De

Wette, Ifuther). The prep. ratò has thus its usual meaning of norma (Winer, Gr. § 49. (d, p. 358) ; the $\delta \dot{v}$ aques, as ver. 9 shows, was great, our readiness in $\kappa \alpha-$ кoлávera ought to be proportionate to it. It need scarcely to be added that this clause must be connected, not with $\epsilon \dot{v} a \gamma-$ $\gamma \in \lambda^{\prime} \varphi($ Heinrich, al.), but with бvvkako-

 $\tau \hat{\eta} \sigma \hat{\eta} \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \alpha \alpha_{\tau} \tau \hat{\eta} \tau ⿺ \hat{v} \mathrm{X} \rho$. [ $\left.\Theta \in o \hat{\imath}\right]$, Theophyl., (E.tum.
9. Tồ $\sigma \omega \sigma \alpha \nu \tau o s ~ \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\alpha} s$ ] 'who saved us,' excreised His saving agency towarls us ;' 'servatio hæe est applicativa, non tantum acquisitiva, eam ipsam ob causam quod tam arcte cum vocatione connectitur,' Beng., compare also Green, $G r$. p. 318; we must. however, in all cases be careful not to assign too low a meaning to this vital word (comp. notes on $E_{p} h$. ii. 8) ; the context will generally supply the proper explanation; see the collection of passages in Reuss, Theol. Iv. 22, Vol. 11. p. 250 . On the act of owinpía applied to God, see notes on 1 Tim. i. 1. Mosheim and, to a certain degree, Wiesinger, refer $\mathfrak{\eta} \mu \hat{s}$ to St. Paul and Timothy: this is very doubtful ; it scems much more satisfactory to give ij $\mu$ eis here the same latitule as in ver. 7 . $\kappa \alpha \lambda \epsilon \sigma \alpha \nu \tau 0 s$ ] The act of calling is always regularly and solemnly ascribed to God the Father; see notes on Cial. i $\cdot \mathrm{G}$, and compare Reuss, Thiol. Iv. 15, Vol. 1r. p. 144 sq . This $\kappa \lambda \hat{i} \sigma t s$ is essentially and intrinsically áyia; it is a $k \lambda i \jmath \sigma t s$ eis кoıvelíà toû Xp., 1 Cor. i. 9. On the 'voratio externa and interna,' see especially Jackson on the Creed, Book xir. 7 (init.). кат $\quad$ rà $\begin{aligned} & \text { ép } \rho \alpha ~\end{aligned}$ $\left.i_{i} \mu\right]$ 'according to our works ;' compare Tit. iii. 5, ov̀к é $\xi$ ép $\beta \omega \nu . . . . . . \ell ้ \sigma \omega \sigma \in \nu$. The prep. кarà may certainly be here refer-

##  

red to the motives (Beza, De W.) which prompted the act ; seo examples in Winer, Gr. § 49. d, p. 358 : it seems, however, equally satisfactory, and perhaps more theologically exact, especially in the latter clause, to retain (with Vulg., Clarom., al.) the more usual meaning ; comp. Eph. i. 11, iii. 11, al.
i $\delta$ i $\alpha \nu \pi \rho o ́ S \in \sigma t \nu]$ 'Hls own purpose;' observe the ioíav; 'that purpose which was suggested by nothing outward, but arose only from the innermost depths of
 ヘัótทtos av́toû óphéusvos, Chrys ; comp. Eph. i. 5. The nature of the $\pi \rho \sigma \hat{\sigma} \epsilon \sigma t s$ is further elucidated by the more specific кal $\chi$ ápı к. $\kappa . \lambda$. ; there is, however, no $\hat{\epsilon} v$ סià $\delta$ voîv, 'propositum gratiosum' (comp. Bull, Prim. Trud. vi. 38), but simply an explanation of the $\pi \rho o$ ífeross $^{\text {b }}$ by a statement of what it consisted in, and what it contemplated.
$\tau \dot{\eta} \nu \delta 0 \hat{\imath} \in \hat{\iota} \sigma \alpha \nu \kappa . \tau . \lambda . \mid$ 'which was given to us in Christ Jesus.' The literal meaning of these words must not be infringed on. $\Delta$ oэeiral is simply 'given,' not 'destined;' it was given from the beginning, it needed only time for its manifestation : $\epsilon \nu$ X $\rho$., again, is not 'per Christum,' Est.' but ' in Christo,' 'in II is

 i. 20, see notes on Eph. i. 7, and the good remarks of Hofmann, Schrifib. Vol. 1. p. .205. $\quad \pi \rho \delta \chi \rho o \delta \omega \nu$ ai $\omega \nu i \omega \nu]$ 'before eternal times ;' compare 1 Cor. ii. 7, $\pi \rho \delta \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ ai $i \omega \nu \omega \nu$, Eph. iii. 11, $\pi \rho \delta \bar{\lambda} \in \sigma \iota \nu$ $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ ai $\omega \nu \omega \nu$, and see notes. The exast meaning of the term $\chi$ póvot aiẃviot (Rom. xvi. 25, Tit. i. 2) must be determined from the context ; in the present case the meaning seems obviously ' from all eternity,' somewhat stronger perhaps than $\pi \rho \delta$ катаßо入ท̂s ко́ $\mu \mu 0 v, \mathrm{Eph}$. i. 4, 'before times marked by the lapse of unnumbered
ages,' times, in a word, which reached from eternity ( $\dot{a} \pi, ~ a i \omega \hat{\omega} \nu s$ ) to the coming of Christ, in and during which the $\mu \nu \sigma \tau \eta$ piov lay $\sigma \in \sigma \iota \gamma \eta \mu \in ́ \nu o \nu$, Rom. xvi. 25 ; see Meyer in loc., and comp. notes on Tit. i. 3, where, however, the meaning is not equally certain.
10. $\phi \alpha \nu \in p \omega \vartheta \in \hat{\imath} \sigma \alpha \nu$ ] 'made manifest,' — not 'realized,' Heydenr. The word implies what is expressed in other passages, e. g. Rom. xvi. 25, Col. i. 26, that the eternal comsels of merey were not only formed before all ages, but hidden during their lapse, till the appointed $\nu \hat{v} \nu$ arrived ; compare notes on Eph. iii. 9. $\tau \hat{\eta} s \epsilon \in \pi \phi \alpha \nu \in[\alpha s]$ 'the appearing;' not merely the simple act of the incarnation( ( $\hat{\eta} s \in \dot{\epsilon} \nu \alpha \nu i \rho \omega \pi \dot{\eta} \sigma \in \omega s$, Theodorct), but, as the context and the verb è $\pi \in \phi \alpha \dot{ } \quad$, Tit. iii. 4 seem to suggest, the whole manifestation of Christ on earth (ěvaapкоз oiкоуоцía, Zonaras, Lex. Vol. ı. p. 806), the whole work of redemption, sc. 'tota commoratio Christi inter homines,' Bengel : so Wiesing., and De W. In the words that follow, the order 'Inoov $\mathrm{X} \rho$. is perhaps to be preferred to the reversed order (Tisch.), both on account of the sceming preponderance of the external evidence (see Tisch. in loc.), and the probability of a conformation to ver. 9. $\kappa a \tau \alpha \rho \gamma \eta$ ' $\sigma a \nu \tau \circ s$ ] 'when He made of none effect,' or, more exactly, 'having made, as He did, of none effect,' not 'who,' etc. Alford ; it being always desirable in a literal translation to preserve the fundamental distincion between a participle with, and a participle without the article ; see Donalds. Gr. § 492, and compare Cratyl. § 305 .
$\tau \delta \nu \dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha \tau$ o $\nu$ ] 'death,'-either regarded (a) objectively, as a personal adversary and enemy of Christ and His kingdom, 1
 i ה̇ávaros; or (b) as a spiritual state or



condition，including the notions of evil and corruption 1 John iii．14，$\mu \in \tau \alpha \beta \in-$
 more probably（ $c$ ）as a power and princi－ ple（ $\tau 0 \hat{v}$ ञaquáтov $\tau \grave{\alpha} \nu \in \hat{v} \rho \alpha$, Chrys．），per－ vading and overshadowing the world； compare Heb．ii．14，\％va סıà тov̂ సิavárou
 $\nu$ átov．The objection to（a）lies in the fact that 1 Cor．xv． 26 refers specially to the second advent of Christ，when Death and the powers of evil，aggregated，as it were，into personalities（comp Rev．xx． 13,14 ），will be individually ruined and overthrown．In（b）again，the usual and proper force of катарүє́ $\omega$（＇render inope－ rative，＇Rom．iii．3，iv．14，al．，or＇dc－ stroy，＇ 1 Cor．xv．24， 2 Thess．ii．8），is too much obscured；while in（c）this is fully maintained，and in the opp．clause （ $\mu \dot{\prime} \nu-\delta \frac{1}{\prime}$ ）the force of $\phi \omega \tau i \sigma \alpha \nu \tau o s$（not
 roytos，comp． 1 Cor．iv． 5 ；the principle of death cast a sliade over the world， Mattl．iv．16）is more distinctly felt．On катарує́ $\omega$ ，comp．notes on Gul．v． 4.
〔 $\omega$ ท̀ $\nu \kappa \alpha\} \dot{\alpha} \phi \uparrow \alpha \rho \sigma\{\alpha \nu\}$＇life and in－ corruption；＇of course no $\stackrel{\text { Ê } \nu}{ }$ ס̀à $\delta$ ovoîv，as Coray，and Wakefield，Sylv．Crit．Vol． 1v．p 208：the latter substantive charac－ terizes and explains the former，not，how－ ever，with any special reference to the resurrection of the body（l Cor．xv．42）， as this would mark $\dot{\alpha} \phi \geqslant \alpha \rho \sigma i \alpha$ as a condi－ tion（＇conditio illa felicissima，＇Leo），but with a reference to the essential quality of the $\zeta_{\omega} \boldsymbol{\eta}$ ，its imperishable and incorrup－ tible nature（ 1 Pet．i．4），and its com－ plete exemption from death（Rev．xxi． 4）：compare Rom．ii．7．It may be ob－ served that Návaios，as a known and ruling power，has the article，（ $\omega\rangle$ ）and a $\phi \vartheta \downarrow \rho \sigma$ ia as only recently revealed，are anarthrous．

ठıむे тov
$\epsilon \dot{u} a \gamma \gamma \in \lambda\left\{\begin{array}{l}0 \\ 0\end{array}\right.$ is perhaps more correctly referred to ф由тíбavtos к．т．$\lambda$（Alf．）than considered as loosely appended to the whole foregoing sentence（ed．1，Wie－ sing．），as it thus seems suitably to define the medium by which the фwitr $\mu$ oेs took place，and to form a natural transition and introduction to ver． 11 sq ．All that follows＇I $\eta \sigma$ ．X $\rho$ ．thus forms（as seems most natural），one connected and subor－ dinate（tertiary）predication ：compare Donalds．Gr．§ 489 sq．
 evangelium prædicandum，＇Est．，not＇in quo，＇Vulg．，Clarom．On the remaining words see notes on 1 Tim．ii．7，where there is the same designation of the apos－ tle＇s offices，though，as the context shows， the application is somewhat different． There the apostle is speaking of his of－ fice on the side of its dignity，here in ref－ erence to the sufferings it entailed on him who sustained it．The éy⿳亠口冋㐅 is thus here not＇dignitatem prædicantis，＇but＇cohor－ tantis；＇$\mu \grave{\eta}$ катaтéoŋns тoívvע èv тoîs
 $\tau o v \tau \alpha ̀ ̀ \nu \in \hat{\nu} \rho a$ ，Chrysostom．
＇$\tau \in \mathfrak{\in} \mathcal{T} \eta \nu$＇＇$I$ was appointed；compare 1 Tim．i． 12.

12．$\delta i$ in $\alpha$ ait $i \alpha \nu\rangle$＇For which cause；＇ scil．because $I$ am thus appointed as a herald and apostle，compare verse 6. This formula is only used by St．Paul in the Pastoral Epistle，ver． 6 and Tit．i： 13 ：see also Heb．ii． 11 ，and Acts xxviii． 20 ；compare also Acts x．21，xxii． 24 ， xxiii．28．$\kappa$ к $\uparrow \tau \alpha \hat{\nu} \tau \alpha]$ ＇even these things；＇bonds，imprisonment， and sufferings，see ver． 8 ，to which the following ėrato $\chi \grave{y} \nu 0 \mu a \iota$ shows a distinct reference．

$$
\AA \pi \in \pi\{\sigma \tau \in \cup \kappa \alpha]
$$ ＇in whom I have put my trust，and still do put it＇（compare notes on Eph．ii．8）， literally，＇to whom I have given my $\pi i \sigma$－

##  

Tts,' scarcely 'on whom I have reposed my faith and trust' (Bloomf.), as this would rather imply $\epsilon \pi l$ with the dative ; see notes on 1 Tim. i. 16, where those constructions are discussed. It need scarcely be said that $\$$ refers to God the Father (ver. 10), not to Jesus Christ.
$\delta \nu \nu a \tau$ 's $\epsilon \operatorname{\epsilon } \sigma \tau \iota \nu]$ ' is able,' has full and sufficient $\delta \dot{v} \nu a \mu$ es, in evident reference to the $\delta \dot{v} v a \mu, s ~ \Theta \epsilon o ̂ ̀, ~ v e r . ~ 8 . ~$
$\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \pi \alpha \rho \alpha$ जे $\hat{\eta} \kappa \eta \nu \mu \circ \nu$ ] 'the trust committed unto me,' 'my deposit,' т $\grave{\nu} \nu$ Tíaтьv $\phi \eta \sigma \ell$ каi тो кйриүна, Theophyl. I, after Chrys. I ; or here, perhaps, with a slight expansion, 'the office of preaching the Gospel,' 'the stewardship committed to the apostle ;' see notes on 1 Tim. vi. 20, The meanings assigned to $\pi \alpha \rho a ฟ$ ท̂к $\quad \nu$ are very numerous, and it must be confessed that not one of them is wholly free from difficulty. The usual reference to the soul, whether in connection with mov as what the apostle had entrusted to God (Beng. ; comp. 1 Pet. iv. 19, Luke xxiii. 46). or as a deposit given by God to man (Bretschn., compare Whitby), is at first sight very specious ; but if, as the context would then seem certainly to require, it had any reference to life, surely єis ėкeív $\nu \quad \tau$. $\mathfrak{\eta} \mu$. must be wholly incongruous ; and if again we refer to 1 Thess. v. 23 (Alf.), the prayer for the entire preservation of the personality is there intimately blended with one for its ${ }_{\alpha}^{\mu} \mu \mu \phi_{i} \alpha$ ( $\alpha \mu \epsilon ́ \mu \pi \tau \omega s ~ \tau \eta \rho \eta \vartheta \epsilon i \eta)$, a moral reference, which finds no true parallel in the simple $\phi u \lambda \alpha{ }_{j} a_{6}$. It is an interpretation moreover unknown to the Greek expositors. Less probable scems the idea of an à $\nu \tau \iota^{-}$ $\mu$ кสitia, 'Theophyl. 3, maintained also by
 iv. 7,8 , for how can this consistently be termed a deposit? We retain, therefore, the meaning advocated in notes on 1 Tim. l. $c_{\text {., with that expansion only which the }}$
context here seems itself adequately to supply. The only difficulty is in $\phi v$ $\lambda a ́ \xi a l$, which is certainly more suitably applied to the holder than the giver of the deposit. The gen. $\mu$ ou is thus the possessive gen., 'the deposit which is definitely mine.' The other interpretations are fairly discussed in the long note of De Wette in loc. $\epsilon$ is $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \in i \nu \eta \nu \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \dot{\eta} \mu$.] 'against that day,' Auth. Version, $i$. $e$. to be produced and forthcoming when that day - not roû શavátou (Coray), but of final reckoning - comes; I shall then render up my trust, through God's preserving grace, faithfully discharged and inviolate. Eis does not seem here merely temporal (John xiii. 1), but has its more usual ethical sense of 'destination for ;' compare Eph. iv. 30, Phil. i. 10, ii. 16, al.
13. モ̌ $\chi$ €] 'have,' as a possession, 'let the intor. be with thee,' Syr. ; not for ка́тєХє, Huth., Wiesing., though somewhat approaching it in meaning; see notes on 1 Tim. iii. 9, and compare $i b$. ch. i. $19 \quad \dot{v} \pi o \tau \dot{v} \pi \omega \sigma \iota \nu]$ 'the delineation, pattern,' $\dagger ;$ is $[$ ' formam ad quam in rebus fidei et vitæ respicitur,' Schaaf| Syr. The meaning of и́тотит. is here only slightly different from that in 1 Tim. i. 16 ; see notes. In both cases ímot. is little more than túmos (sce Rost u Palm, Lex. s. v.) ; there, however, as the context seems to require, the transitive force is more apparent, here the word is simply intransitive; compare Beveridge, Serm. vi. Vol. I. p. 111 (Angl.-Cath. Libr ). What St. Paul had delivered to Timothy was to be to him a 'pattern' and 'exemplar.' to gruide him ;








They which are in Asia all deserted me. The Lord give mercy at the last day unto Onesiphorus.
${ }^{15}$ Oîठas тоv̂то, öть ảтє $\tau \tau \rho a ́ \phi \eta \sigma a ́ v ~ \mu є ~ \pi a ́ \nu-~$


Chrys. and Theod. The subst. ט́motún. dispenses with the article on the principle of correlation (see Middl. Art. III. 3. 6 , p. 48 , ed. Rose), and is moreover sufficiently defined by the following gen.; compare Winer, Gr. § 19. 2. b, p. 114. The omission before the latter words seems properly accounted for (De W.) by the probable currency (comp. עómos) of the formula, compare 1 Tim. vi. 3.
$\dot{v} \gamma \iota \alpha \iota \nu \delta \nu \tau \omega \nu \lambda \delta \dot{\gamma} \omega \nu$ ] 'sound words ;' compare notes on 1 Tim. i. 10.
$\epsilon \boldsymbol{\ell} \pi\{\sigma \tau \in I \kappa$ к. $\tau . \lambda$. specify the principles in which the ímoтint. is to be held. ${ }^{\text {' }} \mathrm{E} \nu$ is not to be joined with $\eta_{k o u \sigma a s, ~ a n d ~}^{\text {a }}$ regarded as equivalent to $\pi \in \rho i$ ('Theodoret, compare Chrysostom), still less with v́रıaьขóvtcuv, (Matth.) but obviously with € $\chi \in$ บ́mot., marking, as it were, the sphere and element to which the holding of the ímot. was to be restricted; compare l Tim. iii. 9.
$\left.\tau \hat{\eta} \in \boldsymbol{\in} \boldsymbol{X} \rho .{ }^{\prime} \mathrm{I} \eta \sigma.\right]$ Specification of the nature of the míats and $\dot{\alpha} \gamma$ ám $\eta$. The anartlırous nouns (contrary to the more usual rule) have an article in the defining clause, as the object is to give that defining clause prominence and emphasis ; 'in Christo omnis files et amor nititur, sine Clristo [extra Christum] labitur et corruit,' Leo: see Winer, Gr. § 19. 4, p. 159, and notes on 1 Tim. iii. 13. Huther joins $\tau \hat{̣}$ èv $\mathrm{X} \rho$. only with $\dot{\alpha} \gamma$ ár $\eta$, but is thus inconsistent with himself, on 1 Tim. i. 14.
14. $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \kappa \alpha \lambda \grave{\eta} \nu \pi \alpha \rho \alpha$ ज̀ good deposit,' 'the good trust committed (unto thee);' the doctrine delivered to Timothy to preach, 'catholice fidei talentum,' as in 1 Tim vi. 20 ; compare above, verse 12, and see notes on both passages. It is here termed the good
trust, as $\dot{\eta} \kappa a \lambda \grave{\eta} \delta \delta \delta \alpha \sigma \kappa \alpha \lambda i ́ a, 1$ Tim. iv. 6, ঠ ka入ds à $\gamma \omega$ $\nu, 1$ Tim. vi. 12.
$\delta \iota \alpha \quad \Pi \nu \in v ́ \mu \alpha \tau o s]$ The medium by which Timothy was to guard his deposit was the IIoly Spirit, still further specified (not without a slight hortatory notice and emphasis) as $\tau 0 \hat{\nu}$ èvoukồv $\frac{\text { è è } \nu}{}$ $\hat{\eta} \mu i \nu$; compare notes on ver. $13: \sigma \pi$ oú- $^{-}$

 Theophyl.
15. oî $\delta \alpha \mathrm{s}$ тôto] The apostle now, with a slight retrospect to ver. 8, stimulates and evokes the energy of his disciple by reminding him of the defection of others. What possibly might have been a cause of depression to the affectionate and faitliful Timothy is actually made by the contrast which St. Paul implies and suggests ( $\sigma \dot{v}$ oû̀ $\tau \in ́ \epsilon v o \nu ~ \mu o v, ~ c h . ~ i i . ~$ 1), an inspiriting and quickening call to fresh efforts in the cause of the Gospel.
$\dot{\alpha} \pi \in \sigma \tau \rho \alpha ́ \phi \eta \sigma \alpha \alpha^{\prime} \nu \mu \epsilon!$ 'turned away from $m e$ :' not an apostasy from the faith (Erasm.), but, as the context implies (comp. ver. 8,16 ), defection from the cause and interests of St. Paul ; aversion instead of sympathy and coöperation;
 The aorist passive has here, as in Matth. v. 42 , the force of the aor. middle ; àmooт $\rho$ '́фоиal with an acc. personce (Heb. xii. 25), or an accus. rei (Tit. i. 14) being both of them legitimate and intelligible constructions; comp. Wincr, Gr. § 39 . 2, p. 233.
 $\tau \hat{\eta}$ 'A $\sigma\{a \mid$ 'all who are in $\Lambda$ sia.' These words can imply nothing else than that those of whom the apostle is speaking were in Asia at the time this Epistle was written ; it being impossible (with Chrys.,

Theophyl., ©cum., al.) to so invert the meaning of the preposition ( $\dot{\epsilon} \nu=\hat{\epsilon} \xi$, or $\dot{a} \pi \delta$ ), as to refer it to Asiatic Christians then at Rome. The àmобтроф́, however, may have taken place in Asia or elsewhere; it may have been a neglect of the absent apostle in his captivity (Leo), or a personal manifestation of it during a sojourn at Rome (De Wette, Wiesing., Huth.). The context, coupled with ch. iv. 16 , seems most in favor of the latter supposition ; so also Wieseler; Chronol. p. 405. Of Phygelus ('Fygelus,' Claromanus) and Hermogenes nothing is known. On the geographical
 'Asia propria') and the wider (Acts xx . 16, 1 Pet. i. 1, Rev. i. 4) or narrower (Acts ii. 9, xvi. 6 ?) applications of the term, see Winer, RWB. Art. 'Asit,' and especially Wieseler, Chronol. p. 31 - 35, where the subject is very satisfactorily investigated.
16. $\left.\delta \omega_{\eta}\right]$ On this form see notes on

 only occurs in this place. Onesiphorus showed é $\lambda$ кos to St. Paul ; the apostle in turn prays that é $\lambda$ cos may be granted to his houschold. From the use of the form 'O $\nu \eta \sigma$. о九̌ к $\omega$ here and ch. iv. 19, but still more the terms of the prayer in ver. 18, it has been concluded, not without some show of probability, that Onesiphorus was now dead; so De W., Huth., Wiesing., Alf., and, as might easily be imagined, Estius and Mack. It does not, however, at all follow that the Romanist doctrine of praying for the dead is in any way contirmed by such an admission, see Hammond in loce, and comp. Taylor, Sermon vilu. (on 2 Sam. xiv. 14).
$\alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu \epsilon \psi \nu \xi \in \nu]$ 'refreshed ;' an ä $\pi$. $\lambda \epsilon \gamma \delta$ ó $\mu$. in the N. T. (the subst. ảvá $\psi v \xi{ }_{\xi}$ s occurs, Acts iii. 19) ; comp. à áémav $\quad$ a , I Cor.'
xvi. 18. Neither from the derivation [ $\psi v ́ \chi \omega$, - not $\psi u \chi \eta \dot{n}$, Beza, itself a derivative from the verb, comp. Orig. de Princ. 11. 8] nor from the prevailing use of the word elsewhere have we sufficient reasons for limiting the ảváభuॄ̧̧s merely to bodily refreshment (Mosh., De W.) ; compare e.g. Xenophon, Hell. vir. 1. 19, тaútp
 $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ ä $\lambda \nu \sigma$ ív $\mu$ ou| 'my chain.' On the singrular 'catenam meam,' Vulg., Clarom., but not apparently Syriac (comp. Mark v. 4, Luke viii. 29] or Goth., compare notes on Eph. vi. 20. As is there remarked, an allusion to the 'custodia militaris,' though not certainly demonstrable, is not wholly improbable ; compare Wiescler, Clironol. p. 405.
$\dot{\xi} \pi a \iota \sigma \chi \dot{\cup} \nu \geqslant \eta$ ] The evidence of the MSS. is here decidedly in favor of this irregular form ; compare however, Winer, (ir. § 12, p. 68, obs. On the meaning of the compound, see notes on ver. 8 .
17. ג̀ $\lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \gamma \in \nu$ ó $\mu \in \nu$ os $\kappa . \tau . \lambda . \mid ' B u t$ on the contrary (far from being ashamed of my bonds) when he had arrived in Rome; ' the à $\lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha}$ answering to the preceding negative, and serving to introduce contrasted conduct which still more enhances the exhortation in ver. 8. The correction of Beza, 'cum esset Romæ,' for 'cum Romam venisset,' Vulg., Claromanus [Romx], (| $\stackrel{0}{2}\}$ is uncalled for, and inexact. Nor is $\gamma \epsilon-$ $\nu \dot{\prime} \mu \in \nu 0{ }^{\prime}$ 'being at Rome' (Hamm.), still less, 'after he had been at R.' (Oeder, Conject. de diff. S. S. loc. p. 733), but literally 'when he arrived and was there;' compare Xenoph. Ancub. Iv. 3,

 Sols.
 ' with greater diligence,' not merely ' with diligence,' Syr., nor even 'very diligent-




 durant. No one, whether soldier, athlete, or husbandman, reaps reward without toil.

ly, Auth. Ver., both of which obscure the tacit comparison. The comparative does not imply any contrast between Onesiphorus and others, nor with 'the diligence that might have been expected ' (Huther), but refers to the increased diligence with which Onesiphorus sought out the apostle when he knew that he was in captivity. He would have sought him out $\sigma \pi$ touôaíws in any case, now he sought for him $\sigma$ тovócuóтєpov; compure Winer, Gr, § 35. 4, p. 217.
$\kappa \alpha i \in \tilde{\nu} \rho \in \nu]$ ' In carcerem conjicitur et arctâ custodiâ tenctur, non ut antea in domo conductâ omnibus notà; unde Onesiphorus non nisi postquam sollicite qucesivisset invenit eum,' Pearson, Aunal. Paul. Vol. 1. p. 395 (ed. Churton).
18. $\delta \mathrm{K}$ v́pıos к.т. 入.] The repetition of Kúpos is certainly not to be explained away as a Hebraistic periphrasis for the pronoun, Coray, Peile ; the examples cited in Winer, Gr. § 22. 2, p. 130, are, as all recent commentators seem agreed, quite of a different nature. It is, however, doubtful whether the first Kúplos is Clurist, and the second God, or vice versi. The express allusion in ékeivn $\tau \hat{\eta} \frac{\eta}{\eta} \mu \epsilon \in p \notin$ to that day when all judgment is committed to the Son (John v.22) seems certainly in favor of the latter supposition : as, however, in ver. $16 \delta$ Kúp., in accordance with the prevailing use in these and St . Paul's Epp. gencrally (see Winer, Gr. § 19. 1, p. 113), seems to be 'our Lord,' $\delta$ K $\dot{v}$ pios can scarcely be otherwise in the present verse ; see Wiesing, in loc. It may be added too, that if the idea of the judicial function of our Loid were intended to be in especial prominence, we should rather have expected rapà Kupíw, 2 Pet. ii. 11, see Winer, Gr. §48. d, p. 352. Even
if this be not pressed, it need scarcely be said that judgment is not unfrequently ascribed to the Father; see Rom. ii. 5 , Heb. xii. 23, al. It may be observed that some MSS. and Vv. (D ${ }^{1} \mathrm{E}^{1}$; Clarom., Sangerm., al.) read $\Theta \in \bar{\omega}$ : this, however, can only be alleged as showing the opinion of the writer, or possibly the current interpretation of the time.
$\delta \iota \eta \kappa \delta \nu \eta \sigma \in \nu$ ] 'he ministered,' - not specially 'unto me' (Syr., Auth. Ver.); for then $\beta$ é $\lambda \tau t o \nu$ would be out of place, or 'to the saints at Ephesus' (Flatt, Heydenr.), but simply and generally; 'how many good offices he performed,' 'quanta ministravit,' Vulg. The assertion of Wiescler, Chronol. p. 463, that Onesiphorus was a deacon at Eph., cannot safely be considered as deducible from this very gencral expression.
$\beta \in \in \tau \not \subset \circ\rangle]$ 'better than I can tell you,' Beza, Huther, al. ; see above, and Wincr, Gr. § 35.4, p. 217.

Cihapter II. 1. $\sigma$ v̀ oôv, $\tau \dot{\varepsilon} \kappa$ vov $\mu \circ \nu]$ 'Thou then, my child;' affectionate aud indlvidualizing address to Timothy, with retrospective reference to ver. 15 sq. The oưv is thus not merely in reference to the example of Onesiphorus (Möller), ver. 16 , still less in mere continuation of the precepts in chap. i. 1-14 (Matth., Len), as the où would thus be otiose, but naturally and appropriately refers to the whole sulyject of the foregoing verses, the general defection of oi $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau \hat{\eta}$ 'A $\begin{gathered}\text { iá } \\ \text { from }\end{gathered}$ St. Paul, and the contrasted conduct of Onesiphorus. This address then, is not simply to prepare Timothy for suffering after his teacher's example ( $\epsilon i \delta \delta \delta \delta \dot{a} \sigma \kappa \alpha-$ $\lambda o s \pi o \lambda \lambda \hat{\varphi} \mu a \hat{\lambda} \lambda o \nu \quad \delta \mu a \imath \geqslant \eta \tau \eta ิ s$, Chrys.), but rather to stimulate him to make up


by his own strength in grace for the cowardice and weakness of others ; see notes on ch. i. 15.
$\epsilon \bar{\epsilon} \delta \nu \nu \alpha \mu o \hat{v}]$ 'be inwardly strengthened;' not with a medial force, 'fortis esto ' Bretschneider (a meaning which it never has in the N. T.), but simply passive : see notes on Eph. vi. 10, and Fritz. Rom. iv. 20, Vol. 1. p. 245. The element and principle in which his strength is to be sought for is immediately subjoined ; comp. Eph. vi. 10 sq.
 the grace;' not $\delta ı$ à $\tau \hat{\eta} s \chi^{\alpha} \rho ı \tau o s, ~ C h r y s ., ~$ Beza. The prepositiou, as its involution in the verb also confirms, points (as usual) to the spiritual sphere or element in which all spiritual strength is to be found. Xápis is clearly not to be explained as the ' preaching of the Gospel' (Hammond on Heb. xiii. 9), nor regarded as merely equivalent to $\tau \grave{\partial} \chi$ д́pıб $\mu \alpha$, ch. i. 6 (comp. Leo), but has its more usual reference to the grace of 'inward sanctification' (compare Hooker, Append. to Book F. Vol. 11. p. 696), and betokens that element of spiritual life 'which enables a man both to will and to do according to what God has commanded,' Waterland, Euch. ch. x. Vol. 1v. p. 666.
$\tau \hat{y}$ E' $\nu \mathrm{X} \rho$. 'I $\eta \sigma$.] '(the grace) which is in Christ Jesus,' which is only and truly centred in Him, and of which He is the mediator to all who are in fellowship and union with Him ; further specification of the true nature of the $\chi$ dpis; ' docet non aliunde contingere quam a solo Christo, et nemini Christiano [qui est in Christo] defuturam,' Calvin: compare Reuss, Thieó. Chrét. 1v. 9, Vol. 11. p. 92, and Neyer on Rom. viii, 39.
2. $\kappa \alpha l$ \& $\kappa . \tau . \lambda$.$] The connection,$ though not at first sight very immediate with ver. 1, is sufficiently perspicuous. Timothy is to be strong himself in grace, and in the strength of it is to provide for
others: he has received the true doctrine (comp. ch. i. 13) ; he is to be trusty himself in dispensing it, and to see chat those to whom he commits it are trusty also. $\delta \iota \alpha, \pi o \lambda \lambda \hat{\omega} \nu \mu a \rho \tau$.] 'among, in the presence of, many witnesses,' 'coram multis testibus,' Tertull. Prcescr. cap. 25 ; nearly $=$ èvótıov, 1 Tim. vi. 12 (Coray in metaph.) : so Chrys., $\pi 0 \lambda \lambda \omega \bar{\nu} \pi \alpha \alpha \sigma \bar{\nu} \omega \nu$, correctly in point of verbal interpretation, but too vague in his explanation, ou $\lambda \alpha \alpha_{-}^{-}$
 סià has here its primary meaning somewhat obscured, though it can still be sufficiently traced to warrant the translation. Timothy heard the instruction by the mediation of many witnesses ('intervenientibus multis testibus'); their presence was deemed necessary to attest the enunciation of the fundamentals of Christian doctrine (scarcely 'a liturgy,' J. Johns. Unbl. Sucr., Part 11. Pref., Vol. II. p. 20, A.-C. Libr.) at his ordination ; they were adjuncts to the solemnity, compare Winer, Gram. § 47. i, p. 338. There is some doubt who the тo入入ol $\mu$ d́prupes were, and what is the exact occasion referred to. The least probable opinion is that they were 'the law and the prophets,' Ecum., after Clem, of Alexandria in his [now fragmentary] Hypot. Book vir. ; the most probable is that they were the preshyters who were present and assisted at. Timothy's ordination ; compare 1 Tim. i. 18, iv. 14. vi. 3, 2 Tim. i. 16 ; seo Scholef. Mints, p. 122. $\pi \iota \sigma \tau \circ \hat{\imath} s]$ 'faithful,' - not 'believing ;' the context evidently requires the former meaning; the $\pi a \rho \alpha-$ ৯ińr $\eta$ was to be delivered to trusty guardians, тoîs $\mu \grave{\eta} \pi \rho \circ \delta \iota \delta o \hat{\sigma} \sigma t$ тठ кй $\quad \cup \gamma \mu a$, Chrys. ; see notes on 1 Tim. i. 12. The verb rapánou seems clearly to point to the $\pi \alpha \rho a s i \kappa \eta$ alluded to in chap. i. 12, 14 , and 1 Tim. vi. 20.



ӧ̈т $\iota \nu \in s$ does not appear to have here any explanatory force，but to refer to the $\pi \iota \sigma$－
 class；＇to faithful men of such a stamp as shall be able，＇ctc．；סv́o пра́үиata 〔 $\eta \tau \epsilon i ̂$


 $\nu \alpha{ }^{2} \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \delta \iota \delta \alpha ́ \xi \eta \eta$, Coray（Romaic）：see notes on Gal．ii．4，and on iv．24．The future Ëqovtat does not necessarily point to Timothy＇s departure（Beng．，Leo），but to the result that will naturally follow the rapáSoris．

Though this verse certainly does not refer to any $\pi$ apá $\delta o \sigma t s$ of doctrines of a more mystical character （Theophyl．），and can never be fairly urged as recognizing any equal and co－ ordinate authority with the written Word （comp．Mack），it still may be said that the instructions seem definitely to con－ template a regular，orderly，and succes－ sive transmission of the fundamentals of Christian doctrine to Christian ministers and teachers，see Mosheim，de Rebus Christ．p．130．On this sulject general－ ly，see the calin and sensible remarks of Waterland，Doctr．of Trin．vir． 5 sq．， Vol．iII．p． 610 sq．

3．$\sigma \nu \nu \kappa \alpha \kappa о \pi \alpha ं \geqslant \eta \sigma o \nu]$＇Suffer af－ fictions with me；＇compare notes on ch． i．8．This reading，supported as it is by AC1D＇E＇FG；17．31，al．；Syr．－Philox． in marg．，and apparently Syriac，Vulg．， Clarom．，Copt．，Arm．（Lachm．，Tisch．）， is now rightly adopted by all recent crit－ ics and commentators except Leo ；so also Mill，Prolegom．p．cxxxyr．It is singular on what grounds Bloomf．（ed． 9）can assert that the Syriac（Pesh．） must have read $\sigma \grave{v}$ oû̀（Rec．）when the
 ted in the present verse ；and wholly in－ conceivable how it can＇be found in the

Vatican B，＇when，as is perfectly well known，this Epistle and 1 ＇Tim．，Titus， Plilem．are not found in that venerable MS．at all；compare Tisch．Prolegom． p．Lxx．
$\sigma \tau \rho \alpha \tau \iota \omega \tau \eta s \mathrm{X}$. ＇I｜＇a soldier of Jesus Christ，＇＇miles quem Christus sibi obstrinxit，＇Leo ；on the gen．comp．notes on Eph．i．1．The nature of the service and its trials and sufferings are vigorously depicted by Tertull．ad Murt．cap． 3 sq．：The scrip－ tural and Pauline（e．g． 1 Cor．ix．7， 2 Cor． x .3 sq ．）character of the image is vindicated by Baumgarten Pasloralbr．p． 106.

4．$\sigma \tau \rho \alpha \tau \in v$ ó $\mu \in \nu$ os］＇serving as a soldier，＇i＞0［serviens］Syr．；Scho－ lef．Hints，p．122．On this use of what Krüger terms the dynamic middle，－in which while the active simply has the intransitive sense of being in a state，the middle also signifies to act the part of one in such a state，－see his Sprachl．§ 52．8．7，and the examples（esp．of verbs in－$\left.\varepsilon^{\prime} \omega\right)$ in Donalds．Gr．$\$ 432.2$, p．437， Jelf，$G r . \S 362.6 . \quad \epsilon^{\prime} \mu \pi \lambda \in \in \in-$ $\tau \alpha$ l］＇entungleth limself，＇＇implicat se，＇ Vulg．，Clarom．＇Hoc versu commendatur т $\delta$ abstine versu sq．sustine，＇Beng．；comp． Chrys．on ver．5．There does not seem any necessity for pressing the meaning of the verb beyond that of＇being involved in，＇＇implicari＇（Cic．Off．Ir．11）；comp． 2 Pet．ii．20，тoútoıs［ $\mu$＇á $\sigma \mu \alpha \sigma \iota \nu$ ］$\epsilon \mu \pi \lambda \alpha-$ кévtes，l＇olyl）．Hist．xxv．9．3，тoîs＇E入－ $\lambda \eta \nu \iota \kappa o i ̂ s ~ \pi \rho \alpha ́ \gamma \mu \alpha \sigma \iota \nu$ є́ $\mu \pi \lambda \epsilon \kappa \dot{\sigma} \mu \in \nu о s$ ，and （with eis）il．1．17．3，xxvir．6． 11.
$\beta$ \｛ov $\pi \rho \alpha \gamma \mu \alpha \tau \in\{\alpha<s]$＇affairs of life，＇＇negotiis vitæ civilis，＇Lco：on the distinction between Bios and the higher term ${ }^{\omega} \omega \dot{\prime}$＇，see Trench，Synonyms，§ 28. It does not seem necessary to restrict $\pi \rho \alpha \gamma \mu$ ．（an ä $\pi \alpha \xi \bar{\lambda} \in \gamma \delta \mu$ ，in the N．T．）to ＇mercatura＇（Schoettg．Hor．Vol．I．p．



887 ；compare $\pi \rho \alpha \gamma \mu a \tau \epsilon \dot{\cup} \epsilon \sigma \hat{\vartheta \epsilon}$ ，Lùke xix． 13）：it rather includes，as the contrast secms to require，all the ordinary callings and occupations of life，which would ne－ cessaily be inconsistent with the special and seclusive duties of a soldier ；comp． Philo，Vit．Musis，1nx．27，Vol．11．p． 167 （ed．Mang．），光 $\gamma \boldsymbol{\omega} \nu$ ка．$\tau \epsilon \chi \nu \hat{\omega} \nu$ т $\tau \hat{\nu}$ єis
 $\tau \eta \sigma \iota \nu, i b$ ．§ 28，p．168，тє́ $\chi \nu a t$ каl $\pi \rho а \gamma \mu$ ．
 т $\eta \sigma \iota \nu$（Wetst．）．Compare Beveridge， Cun．Apost．vi．$\Lambda$ nnot．p．17，who speci－ fies what were considered＇sxecularia ne－ gotia．＇ $\tau \hat{\varphi} \sigma \tau \rho \alpha \tau$ о入о $\sigma \hat{\eta}$ $\left.\sigma a \nu \tau_{l}\right]$＇who enrolled him as a solderr：＇

 ray），is properly＇milites conscribere＇ （Plutarch，Mar．§ 9，al．，compare Dor－ vill．Charit．1．2，p．23），and thence，by a very easy transition，＇deligere militem，＇
$1 \circ$［elegit］Syr．：compare Joseph．

 mun also contend in the games，＇＇certat in agone，＇Vulg．，comp．Schol．Hints，p． 123 ：$\delta$ è introduces a new image（＇quasi novam rem unamquamque enuntiatio－ nem affert，＇Klotz，Devar．Vol．11．p． 362，＇in the second place，＇Donalds．C＇ra－ tyl．§ 155）derived from athletic contests， 1 Cor．ix， 24 sq ．In the former image the Christian，as the soldier，was repre－ sented as one of many；here，as the ath－ lete，he is a little more individualized， and the personal nature of the encounter a little more hinted at；compare notes on Eph．vi．．12．The кal，as usual，has its ascensive force，pointing to the previ－ ous image of the soldier；what applied in his case applies also and further in the case of the athlete ；comp．Klotz，Derar． Vol．II．p．638．Of the two forms，à
$\lambda \epsilon^{\prime} \omega$ and $\dot{\alpha} \vartheta \lambda \epsilon^{\prime} \omega$ ，it is said that（in the best Attic Greek）the latter is more com－ mon in agonistic allusions，the former in more general references（Rost u．Palm， Lex．s．v．å̇ $\uparrow \in \epsilon \dot{u} \omega)$ ；compare，however， Plato，Legy．viri．p．830，with it．Ix．p． 873．$\nu \circ \mu\{\mu \omega s]^{\prime}$＇uccording


 odoret．This，however，must not be restricted merely to an observation of the rules when in the contest，but，as the examples adduced by Wetst．seem cer－ tainly to prove，must be extended to the whole preparation（ $\pi \alpha ́ \nu \tau \alpha$ đoे $\tau o i ̂ s ~ a ̀ i \lambda \lambda \eta$－ tais тробђккодта，Chrys．）before it as well； comp．Arrian，Epict．hir．10，єì עo $\mu$ ípws ぞभ
 Sinicer，Thesuru．s．v．Vol．11．p．414， where the force of this word is well illus－ trated by patristic citations．The tacit
 （Chrys．），thus has its full force．

6．T $\tau \nu \kappa \circ \pi \iota \hat{\omega} \nu \tau a \kappa$ к．т．入．］＇The la－ boring husbandmun must needs first partake of the fints（of lis lubor）．＇There is some difficulty in（a）the connection and（b）the application of this verse．With respect to（a）it seems wholly unnecessary to admit an hyperbaton，sc．$\tau \partial \nu \nu \tau \bar{\omega} \nu \kappa \alpha \rho \pi$.
 a grammatical subterfuge，still partially adrocated ly Winer，Gir．§ 61．4，p． 490 （ed．6）；so Wakefield，Sylv．Crit．Vol．r． p．155．The example which Winer ad－ duces，Xenoph．Cyr．I．3．5，$\delta$ бòs $\pi \rho \omega \hat{\text { atos }}$ тaтijp $\tau \in \tau a \gamma \mu \epsilon \in \nu \alpha$ тoteî，is surely very dif－ furent，being obvious and self explanato－ ry．The meaning of the words seems sufficiently clear if a slight emphasis be
 à $\lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \tau \delta \nu \nu$ кот．，Chrys．），and if．$\pi \rho \hat{\omega} \tau o \nu$


 Guspel for the enke of thice elect; iff, horever, we endure, he will reward w.
(certainly not 'ita demum,' Grot.) be referred to other participators; 'the laboring husbandman (not the idle one) ought to partake first (before all others) of the fruits :' it is his inalienable right ('lex quædam naturæ,' Est.) in consequence of his котоз. If котьิิขта and $\pi \rho \omega ิ$ tov had been omitted, it would have been a mere general and unconnected sentiment ; their insertion, however, turns the declaration into an indirect exhortation, closely parallel to that of ver. 5 :
 фavoûral; ouly the husbandman who kotiộ has the first claim on the fruits.' On the derivation and intension implied in кот. (où $\chi \dot{\alpha} \pi \lambda \omega \bar{s} \tau \lambda\rangle \nu \kappa \alpha ́ \mu \nu о \nu \tau \alpha \alpha \grave{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha}$ тঠ̀ копто́ $\mu \in \nu о \nu$, Chrys.), compare notes on 1 Tim. iv. 10. The real difficulty is in (b) the application: what are the кapmol? Clearly not the support which must be given to ministers (Mosh.), as this would be completely alien to the context; - nor the fruits of his labor and instruction which St. Paul was to reap from Timothy (Beng.), - nor the spiritual gifts which Timothy imparted to others and was to show first in himself (comp. Greg. Nyss. ap. Ecum. ),-but, as the context seems to require and even to suggest, - the future reward (comp. $\sigma \tau \in \phi \alpha \nu \sigma u ̄ \tau a l)$ which the faithful and laborious teacher is pre-eminently to receive in the world to come (compare Matth. v. 12, xiii. 43, xix. 21), not perhaps excluding that arising from the conversion of souls (Theod., and appy Syr.
 to be partaken of even in the present world.
7. $\nu \delta \in t$ ] 'understand, grasp the meaning of; ' not ' perpende,' Beza, or 'atten-
de,' Beng., -translations of $\nu 0$ éw which can hardly be substantiated in the N. T., but 'intellige,' Vulg., $\underset{\Delta}{-2} \frac{1}{4}$ ! [intellige] Syr., as the context and prevailing meaning of the word (see especially Beck, Bibl. Seelenl. 11. 19. p. 56) evi-
 $\tau \alpha \epsilon i ̄ \pi \epsilon$, $\tau \grave{\alpha} \tau o \hat{u} \sigma \tau \rho a \tau ., \tau \grave{\alpha} \tau o \hat{~ a ̀ ̀ \lambda \lambda \eta \tau o \hat{v},}$ $\tau \alpha ̀ ~ \tau 0 \hat{v} \gamma \epsilon \omega \rho \gamma \circ \hat{v}, \nu \dot{\text { óct }} \phi \eta \sigma$ í, Theophylact. The reading in the following clause is not quite certain ; $\delta \not \psi_{\eta} \gamma$ 人̀p к. т. $\lambda$. (Rec.) deserves some consideration on the principle, proclivi lectioni prestat ardua;' the uncial authority [ACDEFG] seems, however, so distinctly to preponderate as to leave it scarcely defensible. If it be retained, $\gamma$ àp may be taken in its most simple and primary meaning, 'sane pro rebus comparatis' (Klotz, Devar. Vol. Ir. p. 232, compare notes on Gal. ii. 6, or, more probably, in its usual argumentative sense (De W., I'eile) ; the command being explained by the prayer.
$\sigma \dot{\nu} \nu \in \sigma \iota \nu \mid$ 'understanding;' according to the somewhat elaborate definition of Beck (Bibl. Sielenl. II. 19, p. 60), the faculty by which we mentally apprehend and are enabled to pass judgment upon what is presented to us; comp. notes on Eph. iii. 4, and Schubert, Gesch. de Seele, § 40 , notes, Vol. II. p. 345 (ed. 4).
8. $\mu \nu \eta \mu o ́ \nu \in v \in$ ] 'bear in remembrance;' here only with an accusative personce: it is found with an acc. rei, Matth. xvi. 9, 1 Thess. ii. 9, Rev. xviii. 5 , but more commonly with a gen. The distinction between the two cases seems to be that with the gen, the meaning is simply 'to remember,' the object being perhaps regarded as that from which, as it were, the memory emanates (comp. Donalds. Gr. § 451 gg .) ; with the accus.

##  

the meaning is rather to ' keep in remembrance,' 'to bear in mind;' see Winer, Gr. § 30. 10, p. 184, and compare Bernhardy, Synt. irr. 51, p. 1:7. The exhortation docs not seem dogmatical ( $\pi \rho d s$ тò̀s aipetıкoùs àmoteıvónevos, Chrysost., Est.), nor even directly hortatory ('recordare, ita ut sequare,' Beng.), but intended to console and encourage. Timothy was to take courage, by dwelling on the victory over death and the glory of his Master,-his Master who was pleased to assume indeed man's nature, yet, as the word of promise had declared, of the kingly seed of David.
$\epsilon ่ \gamma \eta \gamma \in \rho \mu$. दُ $\kappa \nu \in \kappa \rho \hat{\omega} \nu$ must obviously be connected immediately with 'I. X.; not, ' that IIe was raised,' etc., Vulgate, Auth. Ver., Alford (in loc.), but ' us one raised,' etc. (Goth. 'urrisanana') ; compare Winer, Gr. § 45. 4; p. 309, and see Alford on 1 John iv. 2, but correct 'primary,' and 'secondary,' into 'secondary ' and 'tertiary ' (Donalds. Gr. § 417). On the use of the perfect ( $\in \gamma \eta \gamma \in \rho \mu$.) in this and other events in our Lord's life as marking their permanent character, see Green, (in . p. 22.
є́к $\sigma \pi \dot{\epsilon} \rho \mu a \tau$ оs $\Delta a v i ́ \delta]$ Scil. $\gamma \in \nu o ́ \mu \epsilon-$ $\nu o \nu$, not $\tau \delta \nu \gamma \in \nu \dot{\beta} \mu \in \nu \circ \nu$, De Wette. The meaning of this clause, thus placed (apparently with studied emphasis) out of its natural order, can only be properly understood by comparing Romans i. 3. From that passage it wou'd seem that it can here searcely be intended to point to Christ meroly on the side of IIis human nature (Mosh.), and as a bare antithesis to é $\gamma \eta \gamma \in \rho \mu$. : much less has it any reference to current Docetist doctrines (De Wette, Baur, Pastoralbr. p. 102). It points, indeed, as the context here suggests, and the words кaгà $\sigma$ d́pка in Rom. l. c. seem to render certain, to Christ's luman nature; but it points to it at the
same time as derived through the greatest of Israel's Kings, and as in the fulfilment of the sure word of prophecy, Jer. xxiii. 5, Matth. xxii. 42, John vii. 42 ; see Wiesing. in loc., who has very ably clucidated the force and meaning of this clause.
$\kappa \alpha \tau \grave{\alpha} \tau \grave{b}$ є $\dot{u} a \gamma \gamma \mu_{0 \nu}$ ] 'according to my Gospel,' i. e. 'the Gospel entrusted to me to
 Cor. xv. l, comp. Rom. ii. 16, xvi. 25 ; 'suum vocat ratione ministerii,' Calvin on Rom. l. c. The remark of Jerome, 'quotiescunque in epistolis suis dicit Paulus juxta evang. meum, de Lucæ significat volumine,' noticed by Fabricius (Cocl. Apocr. N. T. p. 372), and here pressed by Baur (Pastoralbr. p. 99). cannot be substantiated. There may be an allusion
 ophyl., but it here scarcely seems intended.
9. $\varepsilon^{2} \nu \not{\psi} \mid$ 'in which,' as the official sphere of action, scil. 'in quo preedicando ' Möller, - not, ' on account of which,' Beza 2 : compare Rom. i. 9, 2 Cor. x. 14, Phil. iv. 3. Wiesinger hesitatingly proposes to refer $\begin{gathered}\text { e } \\ \text { § } \\ \Psi\end{gathered}$ to Christ; such a construction is of course possible (comp. Eph. iv. 1), but involves a departure from the ordinary rule of comnection, which does not seem required by the context. $\mu \epsilon \in \chi \rho \& \delta \in \sigma \mu \hat{\omega} \nu]$ 'even unto bonds ; ' compare Phil. ii. 8 ,
 tos. The distinction between $\mu$ é $\chi \rho \iota$ and áxpı, urged by Tittmann, Synon. I. p. 34, according to which 'in $\not{ }_{\alpha} \chi \rho t$ cogitatur potissimum totum tempus [ante], in $\mu$ éxpı potissimum finis temporis [rsque ad], in quo aliquid factum est,' independently of being apparently exactly at variance with the respective derivations [connected with ảkpós, $\mu$ ákpos, see Donalds. Cratyl. § 181], has been fully disproved by Fritz.



Rom. v. 14, Vol. 1. p. 308, note. The only reasonable and natural distinction is that suggested by derivation, viz., that zo $\chi \rho l$, in some passages, seems to preserve an ascensive, $\mu$ é $\chi \rho t$, an extensive reference (sce especially Klotz, Devar. Vol 11. p. 225) ; yet still usage so far contravenes this, that the real difference between the particles seems only to consist in this, that $\check{\alpha} \chi \rho \iota$ is also an adverb, $\mu$ é $\chi \rho \iota$ not so; that $\mu^{\prime \prime}$ ' $\chi \rho t s$ o $\hat{\dot{v}}$ is used with a gen. (Herm. Viger. No. 251), but not so ă $\chi$ pıs oṽ; and finally, that the one occurs in certain formulæ more frequently than the other, and yet that this again seems only fairly referable to the 'usus scribendi' of the author. The note of Fritzsche, Rom. l.c., on these particles, and the good article by Klotz, Devar. Vol. II. p. 224 231 , will both repay the trouble of consultation.
$\kappa \alpha \kappa o \hat{v} \rho \gamma o s]$
' a malefuctor,' only here and Luke xxiii. $32,33,39$. It enhances the preceding
 Theodoret: there may be too perhaps a paronomasia, какотан. какоиิp., 'mala patior tanquam malefactor,' Est.
o $\dot{U} \delta \in \dot{\in} \delta \in \tau \alpha$ l] ' is not (has not been and is not) bound;' with evident allusion (per paranomasiam) to the preceding $\delta \in \sigma \mu \omega \bar{\nu}$. The reference must not be limited to the apostle's particular case ( $\delta \in \sigma$ $\mu o v ̂ \nu \tau \alpha l$ ai $\chi$ eîpes. à $\lambda \lambda \lambda^{\prime}$ oủ $\chi \dot{\eta} \gamma \lambda \omega ิ \tau \tau \alpha$, Chrys. ; 'this hath not restrained me in mine office,' Hamm.), but seems perfectly general, whether in reference to him-
 кal трє́хєь, Theophyl. ; comp. Phil. i. 12. The full adversative force of $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \alpha{ }^{\prime}, ~ ' y e t$, nevertheless, ' must not be left unnoticed ; comp. Klotz, Devar. Vol. II. p. 3.
10. $\delta \iota$ ı̀ $\tau$ ôv $\tau$ o] Scarcely 'quia me vincto evangelium currit,' Beng., still
 rather ' propter hoc, id est, ut evangelium
disseminetur, ut verbum Dei currat et clarificetur,' Est., the negative statement où $\delta$ é $\delta \epsilon \tau a l$ being treated as if it had been a positive statement of the $\pi \rho о к о \pi \grave{y}$ of the Gospel. Having mentioned the bonds which his preaching had entailed on him, he adds with increasing emphasis, $\pi \alpha{ }^{2} \nu \tau \alpha$ $\dot{\text { úrouéver }}$; bonds,-yea all things, sufferings, death : see Acts xxii. 13.
$\dot{v} \pi \boldsymbol{\sigma} \mu \in \in \omega \omega]$ 'endure,' 'sustuin,' 'sustineo,' Vulg., - not exactly ' am content to suffer anything,' Peile ( $\pi \alpha^{\prime} \sigma \chi \omega$, Chrysostom), as this too much obscures the normal meaning of $\dot{i \pi o \mu}$ in the $\mathrm{N} . \mathrm{T}_{\text {., }}$ which is rather that of a brave bearing up against sufferings (' animum in perferendo sustinet,' Tittm. Synon. I. p. 194) than a mere tame and passive sufferance ( $\dot{\alpha} \nu$ é $\chi \in \sigma \geqslant a .1$ ) of them; see below, ver. 12, Rom. xii. 12, James i. 12, al., and contrast à $\nu \in \chi o ́ \mu \in \uparrow \uparrow \alpha, 1$ Cor. iv. 12 ( $\dot{\pi} \epsilon \in ́ \sigma \chi \circ \nu$, Psalm lxxxviii. 50), where a meek suffering is intended to be specially depicted. Even in the case of $\pi \alpha \iota \delta \epsilon i \alpha$, the Christian úmo $\mu$ ével (Heb. xii. 7 Tisch., compare 1 Pet. ii. 20); it is to be the endurance of a quick and living, not the passiveness of a dead and feelingless soul. Thus then the meaning assigned to úrouovì by Reuss, Thiéol. Chret. iv. 20, Vol. Ir. p. 225, as its primary one, viz., 'la soumission pure et simple qui accepte la doulcur,' seems certainly too passive, and is moreover not substantiated by the examples adduced, Rom. viii. 25 , xv. 4, 2 Cor. i. 6 ; see Meyer on 1 Cor. גiii. 7, Fritz. Rom. Vol. I. p. 258.
тoìs E'K入єKтov́s] 'the elect,' those whom God in his infinite mercy, and in accord. with the counsels of IIis 'voluntas
 see notes on Eph. i. 4. There appears no reason whatever for here limiting the ék $\kappa \epsilon \kappa$ тol to those who had not yet received the message of the Gospel (De W.),

## 

'qui adhue ad Christi ovile sunt adducendi' (Menoch, ap. Pol. Syn.), and still less for confining it to those who had already received it (Grot.) : the reference is perfectly general, timeless, and unrestricted. On St. Paul's use of èк$\lambda$ єктoí, comp. Reuss, Théol. Chrét. Iv. 14, Vol. II. p. 133. Itaiav̀тoí] ' they too,' they as weil as I ; ©́s ка. १̀ $\mu$ eis'
 The reference advocated by De Wette, 'they as well as those who already believe,' seems certainly untenable,-on this ground, that it would imply a kind of contrast between the $\pi เ \sigma \tau 0 l$ and $\epsilon_{\kappa} \boldsymbol{\lambda} \boldsymbol{\lambda} \kappa$ toi; whereas the $\pi \iota \sigma \tau o l$, as Wiesinger fairly observes, must both be and remain єк $\lambda \epsilon \kappa$ то!. The tacit reference of the apostle to himself does not involve terms of greater assurance than the date of the Epistle and its language elsewhere (ch. iv. 8) fully warrant.

Tîs $̇ \in \nu$ X $\rho$. 'I.] Emphatic; Tท̂s ưvtws $\sigma \omega t \eta p i a s$, Chrys. On the use of the article, see notes on ch. i. 13 .
$\dot{\mu} \in \tau \grave{\alpha} \delta \delta \dot{\xi} \eta s$ a $i \omega \nu$. is appended to $\sigma \omega$ т $\eta$ pía, and, while serving to enhance it, also marks it as in its highest and completest realization belonging to the future
 Chrys. Thus, then, though there were sufferings in this work, there was in the world to come salvation and glory.
11. $\pi \iota \sigma \tau \delta s \delta \lambda \dot{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \boldsymbol{s}$ ] 'Faithful is the saying:' compare notes on 1 Tim. i. 15. Here, as in 1 Tim. iv. 9 , the use of $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ in the following clause seems to suggest a reference to the preceding words;
 кal aịvíou owтทpías ėmıтev́govтal, Theophyl. after Chrys, ; similarly Cecum. If with Huth., Leo, al., the formula be referred to what follows, the proper force of $\gamma \dot{a} \rho$ can scarcely be maintained : even in its most decidedly explanatory uses, the conclusive force (the ápa portion,
see Klotz, Devar. Vol. II. p. 232), though subordinated to the affirmative, is never so completely obscured (' videlicet,' Peile, 'nimirum,' Leo), as must be the case in the present passage. In Matth. i. 18, noticed by De W., the use of ràp was sugcested by the preceding oúr $\omega$; see Kühner on Xenoph. Mem. I. 1. 6. $\epsilon i \gamma \grave{a} \rho$ к. т. $\lambda$.] It has been asserted by Münter (Christl. Poes. p. 29), Mack, Conybeare, al., that the latter part of this, and the whole of the two following verses are taken from some Christian hymn. Though the distinctly rhythmical character of the clauses (see the arrangement in Mack, who, however, erroncously includes the first $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ in the quotation), and the apparent occurrence of another specimen in 1 Tim. iii. 16, certainly favor such a supposition; still the argumentative $\gamma \grave{\alpha} \rho$ (Lachm., Tisch., with all the uncial mss. except K ) in verse 13 scems so far opposed to the hymnal character of the quotation as to leave the supposition very doubtful. It is not noticed in Rambach's Anthologie, Vol. I. p, 33 , where it would scarcely have been omitted if the hypothesis had not seemed untenable. $\quad \in i \sigma v \nu \alpha \pi \in \mathfrak{N} \alpha$ d$\nu \circ \mu \in \nu$ ] 'if we died with (Hin);' the $\sigma \grave{\nu} \nu$ obviously refers to X $\rho$. 'I $\eta \sigma$. verse 10 . The death here alluded to must, in accordance with the context, be simply of
 $\lambda o u \tau p o v ̂$, Chrysostom and the Greck expositors. In the very similar passage, Fom. vi. 8 , the reference, as ver. 11 sq . clearly show, is ethical ; here, however, such a reference would scem inconsistent with the general current of the argument, and especially with ver. 12. The aorist must not be passed over; it marks a single past act that took place when we gave ourselves up to a life that involved similar exposure to sufferings and death ; the apostle died when he embraced the



lot of a daily death ( $\kappa a s{ }^{\prime}$. $\dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon ́ \rho \alpha \nu$ àmoэ̀v̀n$\sigma \kappa \omega, 1$ Cor. xv. 31), and of a constant
 Cor.iv. $10 . \quad \sigma v \nu$ §'ท $\sigma \sigma \mu \in \nu]$ ' we shall live with (Him),' not in an ethical sense, but, as the antithesis necessarily requires, with physical reference to Christ's resurrection (comp. ̇̇ $\gamma \eta \gamma \in \rho \mu \epsilon$ 'עov, ver. 8) ; by virtue of our union with Him in His death, we shall hereafter share with Him His life ; comp. Phil. iii. 10.
12. $i \pi 0 \mu \in ́ v o \mu \in \nu]$ 'endure,' scil. with Him ; present ; this was a continuing state. On the meaning of $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi о \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \in \iota \nu$, see notes on ver. 10 .
$\sigma v \mu \beta a \sigma \iota \lambda \in v \dot{v} \sigma \quad \mu \in \nu]$ 'we shall reign with (Him);' extension of the previous idea $\sigma u \nu\langle ̧ \eta ̆ \sigma o \mu . ~: ~ n o t ~ o n l y ~ s h a l l ~ w e ~ l i v e, ~$ but be kings with Him ; comp. Rom r. 17, viii. 17. Rev. i. 6. $\sum \nu \mu \beta \alpha \sigma$. is only a $\delta \ell_{s} \lambda \in \gamma \dot{\sigma} \mu$. in N. 'T., here and 1 Cor. iv. 8 ; compare Polycarp, Phil. 5.
$\dot{\alpha} \rho \nu \eta \sigma \delta \mu \in \mathcal{N} a$ ] 'shall deny, -' aut facto, aut verbo, aut etiam silentio,' Est.; compare Matth. x. 32, 33 : oủk $\in ่ \nu$ тoîs
 ai àuoı $\beta$ á, Chrys. The future conveys the idea of the ethical possibility of the action ; compare Winer, $G r . ~ § 40.6, \mathrm{p}$. 241 : we have thus in the hypothetical clauses, aorist, present, and future. The precedence of $\dot{\alpha} \rho \nu \in i \sigma \vartheta \Delta a s$ to $\dot{\alpha} \pi เ \sigma \tau \epsilon i \nu$ is not to be ascribed to the fict that ' abnegatio fidem quæ fuerat extinguit,' Beng., but rathe to this fact, that a persistent state of unbelief ( $\grave{\pi}\lrcorner \sigma \tau o \hat{\mu} \mu \in \nu$ ) is far worse than a denial which might be (as in the case of St. Peter) an act conmmitted in weakness and bitterly repented of; compare Leo. The reading is not quite certain : d. $\rho \nu o v ́ \mu \in \vartheta \alpha$ (Rec.) is well supported [DEKL; al.], but seems, on the whole, more probably, corrected to harmonize
with the pres. $\dot{v} \pi o \mu \epsilon \in \nu \rho \in \nu$, than altered to balance à $\rho \nu \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \tau \alpha \iota$.
13. $\epsilon i \dot{\alpha} \pi \iota \sigma \tau o \hat{v} \mu \in \nu]$ 'if we are unbelieving' - or to preserve the paronomasia 'are faithless,' ష̈тเซтol è $\sigma \mu \in \nu$ (comp. Fritz. Rom. iii. 3), 一 not specifically ' in Him' (Syr.), or 'in His resurrection,' ठ̊т $\mathfrak{a} \nu$ 'є́ $\sigma \tau \eta$ (Chrys.), or 'in His divinity,' ठ̋тı Өєós ধ̇ $\sigma \tau \iota$ (Excum. 2), -but generally, 'if we exhibit unbelief,' whether as regards His attributes, His promises, or Ilis Gospel ; 'infidelitas positiva significatur, quæ est corum qui veritatem auditam recipere nolunt, aut semel receptam deserunt,' Estius. De Wette, Wiesing. and others following Grotius translate ă $\pi \iota \sigma \tau$. 'uutreu sind,' 'are unfaithful,' appealing to the similar passage, Rom. iii. 3. This is certainly plausible on account of the following $\pi เ \sigma \tau$ ós, still neither there (see especially Meyer in loc.) nor here is there sufficient reason for departing from the regular meaning of àmıбтeiv (Mark xvi. 11, 16, Luke xxiv. 11, 41, Acts xxviii. 24), which, like à $\pi เ \sigma-$ tia, seems always in the N. T. to imply not 'untrueness,' 'unfaithfulness,' but definitely 'unbelief.' This is still further confirmed by the species of climax, áapq$\sigma o ́ \mu$., à $\pi เ \sigma \tau o \hat{\mu} \mu \in \nu$; see above, on ver. 12. $\pi \iota \sigma \tau$ ós] 'faithful,' both in His nature and promises ; compare Deut. vii, 9. Though we believe not Him and His promises, yet He remains unchanged in His faithfulness and truth; $\pi \iota \sigma \tau$ ós द̇ $\sigma \tau \iota$


 Arian. III. Vol. 1. p. 377 (Paris, 1627). où $\delta \dot{v} \nu a \tau \alpha$ ] 'He cannot' deny Himself, or be untrue to His own essential



Charge men to avoid bab－
blinge which really lead to the subversion of faith． God knows his own．


 тatat，Origen，Cels．cap． 70 ；see also Pearson，Creed，Art．vi．Vol．1．p． 339 （ed．Burt．）．On the aor．infin．after $\delta v^{\prime}$－ vatal see notes on Eph．iii． 4.

14．T $\alpha \hat{v} \tau \alpha$ vi $\pi о \mu i \mu \nu$ ．］＇put（them） in remembrance of these things，＇scil．of the truths mentioned in ver．11－13；comp． Tit．iii．1， 2 Pet．i．12．The most natu－
 גous（Theoph．，CEcumenius），but aủtoús （Syr．），whether generally＇ens quibus proes，＇Bengel，or，as the meaning of the verb seems to suggest，＇the faithful，＇ those who already believe，but require to be reminded of these eternal truths．
$\delta \iota \alpha \mu \alpha \rho \tau v \rho o ́ \mu \in \nu \circ s]$＇solemnly charg－ ing them ；＇similarly with an inf．Polyb． Hist．1．33．5，ib．37．4，III．15． 5 ：see notes on 1 Tim．v． 21.
$\mu \dot{\eta}$ 入o $\gamma$ o $\left.\mu \alpha \gamma_{\mathrm{C}} \in โ \nu\right]$＇not to contend about zordls，＇＇not to indulge in $\lambda$ ооо $\mu a x^{\prime}$ au ；＇ 1 Tim．vi．4，where see notes．The reading is somewhat doubtful ：Lachm． reads $\lambda$ orouáx $\epsilon$ with $\mathrm{AC}^{1}$ ；Vulg．，Cla－ rom．，Weth．；Latin Ff．；so also Tisch． ed．1，who，however，in ed．2，7，has（as it would seem rightly）restored the infin． with C3DEFGKL；nearly all mss．； Syr．（both），Goth．；Clem．，Chrysost．， Theod．，al．；so Mill，Prolegom．p．xux． Though the change from the imper．to the intin．might be thought not wholly improbable，as the infin．might seem an easier reading（comp．however，ch．iv． 2），yet a conformation of the inf，to the preceding and succeeding imp．secms equally plausible．The preponderance of external authority may thus be allowed to decide the question．If the imp．be adopted，a stop must be placed after $\mathrm{K} \dot{\nu}$－ píov．$\epsilon$ is oủ $\delta \dot{\varepsilon} \nu \chi \rho \dot{\eta} \sigma t \mu \circ \nu]$ ＇（a course）useful for nothing ；＇not an independent clause，＇ad nihil utile est，
nisi，etc．，Vulg．，sim．Clarom．，but，in opposition to the preceding sentence； compare Mark vii．19，and see Winer， Gri．§ 59．9，p．472．The reading is here again by no means certain；Lachm．and Tisch．（ed．7）adopt $\epsilon^{\prime} \pi^{\prime}$ oùס̀̀ $\nu$ with AC： 17 （ $\bar{\epsilon} \pi$ ’ où $\delta \epsilon \nu l$ l ${ }^{\prime} \rho, \mathrm{FG}$ ）；so Huther．It is possible that eis might have been changed to avoid the seeming difficulty of $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi l$ twice used thus contiguously，and the $\epsilon^{\prime} \pi{ }^{\prime}$ ouv $\delta \in \nu \grave{l}$ of FG might have been a correction ：still，it is also not improba－ ble that the eye of the writer might have been caught by the following eimi，and the substitution accidental．The MSS． authority［DEKL］and St．Paul＇s love of prepositional variation（comp．notes on Gal．i．1）incline us to the reading of the Text（Tisch．ed．2）；so De．Wette and Wiesing．In eis où $\delta \dot{\text { en }} \boldsymbol{\nu} \nu$ the idea of destinution is marked perhaps a little more laxly（compare Acts xvii．21，and Winer，Gr．§ 49．a，p．354），in＇̇ $\pi^{\prime}$ ov̉ $\delta \in \notin \nu$ （comp．＇̇ $\phi$＇$\delta$ ，Matth．xxvi．50，scil．Tò катえ̀ бкóто⿱ тра́ттє，Euthym．；［De－ mosth．］Aristog．p．779，è $\pi l$ кад $\lambda \nu \nu \pi \rho a ̂ \gamma-$ $\mu a \quad \chi \rho \eta \eta^{\prime}(\mu \omega s)$ a little more stringently． It is singular that $\chi \rho \neq \sigma \sigma \mu \circ \nu$ is an $\alpha \not \pi \alpha \xi$
 cver，is found with eis in ch．iv． 11.
ह่ $\pi$ ！к $\alpha \tau \alpha \sigma \tau \rho \circ \phi \hat{\eta} \mid$＇for the subversion，＇ not，as it onght to be，for the edification （oikoঠoни）of the hearers ；compare eis кavaíperiv， 2 Cor．xiii．10．＇ETl here seems to include with the idea of purpose and object（comp．notes on Gal．v．13， and on Eph：ii．10）that also of the result to which the $\lambda$ orouaxiat inevitably led， ＇subversionem pariunt，＇Just．＇The pri－ mary ohject of the false teachers，in ac－ cordance with their general character， might have been to convince，or to make gain out of the hearer（comp．Tit．i．11）， the result，contemplated or no，was his


катабтрофŋ́. These ideas of purpose and result are frequently somewhat blended in this use of $\vec{e} \pi l$ with the dative ; comp.
 formula $\uparrow \grave{\eta} \nu$ éni ฟ人várẹ, Arrian, Anab. rii. 8. 7 (Xenoph.ib. 1.6.10), and see Winer, Gr. § 48. c, p. 351, Bernhardy, Synt. v. 24, p. 2.s1.
15. $\delta$ b́ki $\mu$ o $\nu$ ] 'approved,' one who can stand the test (comp. סócuдо⿱ àp $p u^{-}$ ptov, Poll. Onomast. III. 86), just as à $\delta \delta^{-}$ кtuos (ch. iii. 8, Tit. i. 16) is one who cannot (compare Rom. xiv. 18, xvi. 10, 1 Cor. xi, 19, al.), explained more fully in the following clause, but obviously not to be joined with $\epsilon^{\prime} \rho \gamma \alpha \dot{\tau} \tau \eta \nu$ (Mack). The termination $-t-\mu \circ$ (the first part of which points to quality, the second to action, Donalds. Cratyl. § 258) is annexed according to somewhat differing analogies ; comp. Buttm. Gr.§ 113. 13.
$\pi a \rho a \sigma \tau \eta \bar{\eta} a t \tau \hat{\varphi} \Theta \epsilon \hat{\varphi}]$ 'exhibere Deo,' Vulg., Clarom., ; compare Rom. vi. 13, 1 Cor. viii. 8, Eph. v. 27 : the assertion of Tholuck (on Rom. l. c.) that $\pi a \rho เ \sigma \tau \alpha$ $\nu \in \iota \nu \tau i v \ell t \iota$ is 'jemandem etwas zu freiem Gebrauch vorlegen,' cannot be substantiated; it is simply 'sistere, exhibere, alicui aliquid' (Fritz. Rom. Vol. 1. p. 403), the context defining the application and modifying the translation.
' $\left.\rho \gamma \alpha{ }^{\prime} \tau \eta \nu\right]$ 'a workman,' not perhaps without reference to the laborious nature of the work, the $\epsilon_{\rho} \rho \gamma o \nu \in \dot{U} a \gamma \gamma \in \lambda \iota \sigma \tau o \hat{v}$, ch. iv. 5, al. : similarly, but with $\Omega$ bad reference, 2 Cor. xi. 13, Phil. iii. 2 ; compare Deyling, Obs. Vol. iv. 2, p. 623.
$\dot{\alpha} \nu \in \pi a\{\sigma \chi \nu \nu \tau o \nu]$ ;'not ashumed;' ä $\pi$. $\lambda \in \gamma \delta \dot{\mu}$.: not with any active or middle force ( $\delta \delta^{\text {E }} \rho \gamma \alpha^{\prime} \tau \eta s$ où$\delta \grave{\nu} \nu$ aí $\chi$ र́veтaı $\pi \rho a ́ \tau \tau \epsilon \iota \nu$, Chrys.) withı reference to feeling shame in the cause of the Gospel (Theoph., Eecum. ; compare
 'non pudefactum,' Bengel ;) comp. Phil.

## 

o $\rho$ जิ o $\tau \circ \mu \circ \hat{v} \nu \tau \alpha$ ] 'cutting, laying out, straightly,' as a road, etc. ; compare The-

 rious interpretations have been assigned to this passage, in most of which the idea
 тoıầта єैккоттє, Chrysost. ; 'translatio sumpta ab illà legali victimarum sectione,' Beza; 'acsi pater alendis filiis panem in frusta secando distribuat,' Cal-vin,- is unduly pressed and arbitrarily explained. The real emphasis, however,
 $\pi o \delta \in i v$, Gal. ii. 14, and the force of the adjective in кalvoto $\mu \in i ̂ v$, Plato, Legg. VIr. p. 797 B , al. ; but this again must not be pressed to the complete exclusion of the verbal element, as in Greg. Naz. Orat. rr.
 ס́סevév, sce Kypke, Obs. Vol. Ir. p. 370. Thus, then, it will be most correct to adhere closely to the primary meaning 'to cut in a straight line' (Rost u. Palm, Lex. s. v.), and to regard it as a metaphor from laying out a road (compare
 or drawing a furrow (Theod.), the merit of which is to consist in the straightness with which the work of cutting or laying out is performed. The word of truth is, as it were, an $\delta \delta o ́ s$ (comp. De Wette), which is to be laid out straightly and truly. The meaning is rightly retained
 cans recte] and Vulg.. 'recte tractantem verbum veritatis,' but the metaphor is thus obscured. For the varions interpretations of this passage, see Wolf, in loc. Vol. iv. p. 513 sq ., and especially 1)eyling, Obs Vol. Ir. 2, exerc. III. 10 sq. , p. 618 sq., where this expression is rery elaborately investigated. $\tau \hat{\eta} s \dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta$ :



Teías］＇of Truth，＇not the gen．of appo－ sition，but substantice；see notes on Eph． i．13，and compare Seheuerlein，Synt．§ 12．1，p． 82.
16．$\kappa \in \nu \circ \phi \omega \nu\{a s$ ］＇babblings；＇only here and 1 Timothy vi． 20 ，where see notes．$\quad \pi \in \rho \cdot \hat{\sigma} \sigma \tau \sigma \sigma$ ］＇withdruw
from，$\propto_{0} \mathbb{\Delta} \mid$ Syr．，$\pi \epsilon \rho i \phi e v \gamma \epsilon$ ，Hesych．，－not＇cohibe， sc．ne alterius grassarentur＇（Raphel， Beza，and even Suicer，Thesaur．s．v． Vol．II．p．673），a meaning not lexieally tenable．It occurs in the N．T．（in the present form）only here and Tit．iii．9； comp．Lucian，Hermot，§ 86，е̇ктрaтทíoo－
 Hist．iII．84． 11 （cited by Raphel），as there the verb has its usual meaning． The expression $\pi \epsilon p$ iataãal $\tau t$ or $\tau$ va （the latter［in the sing．］condemned by Lucian，Pseudos．§ 4，and Thom．M．s． v．p．708，ed．Bern．，but defended by Lo－ beck，Soph．Ajux，82，p．109），in the sense of making a circuit so as to avoid，， －surely not＇to hedge one＇s self in，＇ Peile，－occurs occasionally in later wri－ ters；see examples in Elsner，Obs．Vol． ir．p．314，Rost u．Palm，Lex．s．v．Vol． 11．p．846，and compare Dorville，Chari－ ton，I．13，p．136，by whom this use of $\pi \in \rho \bar{i} \sigma \tau$ ．is fully illustrated．
$\pi \rho$ око́廿 ov $\sigma \iota \nu$ ］＇they will make advance，＇ scil．＇the false teuchers，＇those who utter the $\kappa \in v o \phi \omega v i a s ~(c o m p a r e ~ a j ̀ t \omega ิ \nu, ~ v e r . ~ 17, ~$ and chap．ii． 9,13 ），not the kevoqoviar themselves，Luther，al．Observe the fu－ ture，which shows that the error of the false teachers in its most developed state had not yet appeared；see notes on 1 Tim．i．3．The form $\pi$ токórт $\omega$ ，though condemned by Lucian，Pseudos．$\S 5$ ，is rightly maintained by Thom．M．and Phrynichus：the subst．прокож $े$ is how－ ever indefensible，see notes on 1 Tim．iv．

15．It is used in the N．Test．de bono （Luke ii．52），de malo（here，and ch．iii． 9，13）and de neulro（Rom．xiii．12）．
$\dot{\alpha} \sigma \in \beta \in\{\alpha s$ ，＇of impiety，＇or，better to preserve the antithesis to eivé $\beta$ ．，＇of un－ godliness；＇genit．dependant on $\pi \lambda$ ciov， and either the gen．of the point of view （Sheuerl．Symt．§ 18．1，p．129），or more probably the gen．materix，as in the gen． after тоїто，тобойто，к．т．入．；compare Joseph．Bell．vi．2．3，тpoüroчà eis to－ бoîtov $\pi$ aparoulas（De W．），and see Kíri－ ger：Sprachl．§ 47．10．2．In such cases， as Kruiger observes，the gen．is com－ monly anarthrous，and a preposition（as here）not unfrequently precedes．
17．$\gamma \dot{\alpha} \gamma \gamma \mathrm{patva]}$＇a gangrene，＇＇an eating sore ；＇according to Galen on Hip－ pocr．de Artic．Vol．xir．p．407，interme－ diate between the $\phi \lambda \in \gamma \mu o \nu \grave{\eta}$ and the $\sigma \phi \alpha^{-}$ $\kappa \in$ Ros，and leading the way to the latter． The expression $\nu o \mu$ ไो $\nu$ é $\xi \in \mathrm{cc}$（＇pastionem habebit，＇Erasm．）and the deriv．of raryp． ［rpá $\omega$ ，rpaivo，connected with Sanser． gras，＇devorare，＇compare Pott，Etym． Forsch．Vol．I．p． $278 \mid$ both point to the evil as being extensive in its nature（com－ pare Gal．v．9，and notes in loc．）rather than intensive（Mack），though it is not improbable that the $\boldsymbol{\gamma} a \gamma$－was primarily an intensive reduplication；see Bopp， Grammar，p．569．So also distinctly， though somewhat paraphrastically，Syr．
$12 \hat{\sim}=0$ 号 multos ；compare Ovid，Metam．11．825， ＇solet immedicabile cancer Serpere，et illæsas vitiatis addere partes．＇The er－ ror of these teachers was spreading，and the apostle foresces that it was still fur－ ther to spread，and to corrupt the Ephe－ sian community to a still more lamenta－ ble extent ；＇res miserabili experimento notior quam ut pluribus verbis declarari debeat，＇Estius．
$\left.{ }^{\prime} \Upsilon \mu \epsilon{ }^{\prime} \nu, \kappa \ll\right\}$



$\Phi[\lambda$.$] Two false teachers of whom noth－$ ing certain is known；Vitringa（Ohs． Sacr．iv．9，Vol．1．p．926）thinks that they were Jews，and probably Sadducees． The later supposition seems very doubt－ ful；compare next note，and Burton， Bampt．Lect．p． 135 sq ．Hymenæus is probably the same as the false teacher mentioned in 1 Tim．i． 20 ；see notes in loc．
 them with a very faint explanatory force as members of a class；see notes on Gal． ii． 4.
 к．т．$\lambda$ ．］＇as concerning the truth，missed their aim：＇so 1 ＇Tim．vi．21．On ŋ̀ $\sigma$ óx $\chi$ ． compare notes on 1 Tim．i． 6 ，and on the use of $\pi \in \rho \rho^{\prime}$ ，notes on ib．i． 19 ．
$\lambda$＇ुरovtes к．т．$\lambda$ ．＇saying that the re－ surrection has already taken place：＇char－ acteristic and distinguishing feature of their error．All recent commentators very pertinently adduce Iren．Heer．ir． 31，＇esse resurrectionem a mortuis agni－ tionem ejus que ab ipsis dicitur verita－ tis；＇T＇Tertull．de Resurr．19，＇asseverantes ．．．．．resurrectionem eam vindicandam quâ quis aditì̀［additì，Phen．，Seml．］veritate redanimatus et revivificatus Deo，igno－ rantix morte discussti，velut de sepulehro veteris hominis eruperit；＇Augustine， Epist．119，＇nonnulli．．．．．．．arbitrati sunt jam factam esse resurrectionem，nee ul－ lam ulterius in fine temporum esse spe－ randam．＇These quotations both verify the apostle＇s prediction，and serve to de－ fine with some show of probability，the specific nature of the error of Hymenaus and Philetus．The false asceticism which is so often tacitly alluded to and con－ demned in these Epistles，led very prob－ ably to an undue contempt for the body （developed fully in the＇hylic＇theory of the Gnostics，Theod．Heer，I．7，compare

Neander，Hist．of Ch．Vol．ni．p． 116. Clark），to false views of the nature of death（see Tertull．l．c．），and thence to equally false views of the resurrection： death and resurrection were terms which had with these false teachers only a spir－ itual meaning and application：＇they allegorized away the doctrine，and turned atl into figure and metaphor，＇Waterland Doct．of Trin．Iv．Vol．Irr．p．459．Grin－ field（Schol．Hellen．p．603）cites Polyc． Philipp．7，but there the heterodoxy seems of a more fearful and antinomian charac－ ter．The error of Marcion to which Baur（Pastorallor．p．38）here finds an allusion，was of a completely different kind ；＇Marcion in totum carnis resur－ rectionem non admittens，et soli animæ salutem repromittens，non qualitatis sed substantix facit questionem，＇＇Tertullian Murc．v．10．The reference to the re－ newal of generations ék đaı⿱亠⿱八乂力 odoret），or to the resurrection at the cru－ cifixion，Mattl．xxvii． 52 （Schoetty．）， searecly need be alluded to．Further notices of this early heresy will be found in Walsh，Gesch．der Ketz．Vol．i．p． 129，Burton，Bampt．Lect．Note 59，p． 428；compare Usteri，Lehrb．iI． 2 в，p． 344.
$\dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha \tau \rho \in ́ \pi$ о $v \sigma เ \nu$
к．т．入．］＇subvert the faith of some；＇see Tit．i．11．We cannot safuly infer from this use of $\tau$ uvev that the number of the subverted was small（compare Chrysost．
 ＇sundry persons，＇the old German＇et－ welche，＇Krüger，Sprachl．§ 51．16，14； comp．Meyer on Rom．ii．3．
19．$\mu$＇́ $\nu \tau 0$ I］＇hoverer，nevertheless；＇ this compound particle，－which prima－ rily conveys＇majorem quandam asseve－ rationem＇（Kiotz，Dezar．Vol．II．p． 663），and，as its composition shows， unites both confirmation（ $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu$ ）and re－

striction ( $\tau 0$ ó), 'certe quidem' (Hartung, Partik. Vol. 1. p. 593).-frequently, as in the present case, involves an opposition to a preceding clause, and meets a possible objection; 'though some may be subverted, yet assuredly the firm foundation of God stands unshaken as ever;' ' quamvis quorundam subvertatur fides, non tamen fundamentum Dei,' Estius. The particle only occurs here in St. Paul's Epistles, five times in St. John (ch. iv. 27, vii. 13 , xii. 42, xx. 5 , xxi. 4), once in St. James (ch. ii. 8), and once in St. Jude (ver. 8). As a general rule, $\mu \in ́ \nu \tau o l$ is perhaps most correctly printed as one word, as in Lachm., Tisch., especially when other enclities are joined with it; see Ellendt, Lex. Soph. Vol, in. p. 80. $\sigma \tau \in \rho$ शि $\mu \in \dot{\epsilon} \lambda$. $\tau$ oर̂ $\Theta \in 0 \hat{v}]$ 'the firm foundation of Godl;' i. e. 'laid by Him,' not so much a possessive gen. as a gen. auctoris or originis, see Scheuerl. Synt. § 17.1 , p. 125, compared with p. 115 , and with notes on 1 Thess. i. 6. It is unnecessary to recount the different and very arbitrary interpretations which this expression has received. The only satisfactory interpretation is that adopted by Est. x, Tirin. (ap. Pol. Syn.), and now nearly all modern commentators, according to which the సิє $\mu$ '́ $\lambda$. тô̂ Өєô̂ is the Church,- - not merely the $\sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \in a l$ quxal (Chrysostom), the $\dot{\alpha} \pi \in \rho$ it $\rho \in \pi \tau о z$ (Ccum.), viewed separately, and in contrast with the subverted (comp. Neander, Planting, Vol. 1. p. 492, Bohn), but collectively, the єєкк $\eta$ -

 for oikos, Coray, al., but $(a)$ to mark the Church of Christ and His apostles as a foundation placed in the world on which the whole future oikoठo $\mu$ クे rests (compare Eph. ii. $20 \mathrm{sq}$. .) ; and ( l ) to convey the idea of its firmness, strength, and solid-
ity; compare especially 1 Tim. iii. 15. On $\uparrow \in \mu$ én . compare notes on 1 Tim. vi. 19. Notices of the various a aberrant interpretations will be found in De W. in loc. $\quad$ € $\chi \omega \nu]$ 'seeing it hath;' part., with a very faint causal force, illustrating the previous declaration: comp. Donalds. Gr. § 615.
$\tau \dot{\eta} \nu$ $\sigma \phi \rho \alpha \gamma \hat{i} \alpha \alpha \tau \alpha \dot{v} \tau \eta \nu]$ 'this seal,' i.e. 'impression, inscription ; ' compare Rev. xxi. 14, where each $\uparrow \epsilon \mu \mu^{\prime} \lambda i o s$ had the name of an apostle inscribed thereon. There may possibly be, as De Wette suggests, an allusion to Deut. vi. 9, xi. 20. The term $\sigma \phi \rho a \gamma i \delta a$ is used rather than $\dot{\epsilon} \pi i \gamma \rho a \phi \dot{\eta} \nu$ to convey the idea of its solemn, binding, and valid character. Of the two inscriptions, the first E$\gamma \nu \omega$ $\kappa . \tau, \lambda$. seems certainly an allusion to
 тoû [Heb. yัụ ], and is in the language of grave consolation, John x. 14, 27 ; 'He knoweth, not necessarily 'novit amanter,' Beng., (compare notes on Gal. iv. 9) who are His true servants, and will separate them from those who are nut.' On the practical aspects of this declaration, compare Taylor, Life of Christ, 111. 13, disc. 16 , and the brief but consolatory remarks of Jackson, Creed, xir. 6. 3. The second $\kappa \alpha i \grave{\alpha} \pi o \sigma \tau$. к.т $\lambda$. is possibly in continued allusion to Numb. xvi. 26, ároo $\chi$ ı $\sigma$ -
 คผ̂ע $\tau o u ́ \tau \omega \nu$, though expressed in a wider and more general form (compare Isaiah lii. 11) and is in the language of waming. $\delta$ ò vouá $\zeta \omega \nu \mid$ 'who mameth;' not $\mid$ ino? [qui vocat] Syr. 'qui invocat' Wahl, but, 'qui nominat,' Vulg.(misquoted by Bez.), Goth.,- scil. as his Lord and God, ‘ qui rogatus cujus sit disciplinæ Christum nominat ut magistrum,' Grot. ; compare Isaiah xxvi. 13, Kúple éktós $\sigma o u$ ằ $\lambda \lambda 0 \nu$




$\dot{\alpha} \delta \iota k[a s]$ 'unrighteousness,' the oppo. site of $\delta \iota \kappa a \iota o \sigma v ́ v \eta$, Aristot. Thet. 1. 9. 7, joined by Plato, Gorg. p. 477 c, with $\sigma \dot{\mu} \mu \pi \alpha \sigma \alpha \psi v \chi$ भิs $\pi о \nu \eta \rho i \alpha$. In its Christian usage and application, it is similar in meaning to, but of wider reference than, àvouía, compare 1 John v. 17; 'ảồкía de quâcunque improbitate dicitur, quatenus т仑̂ סıкаíw repugnat,' Tittmann, Synon. I. p. 48 ; as $\delta \iota \kappa \alpha \iota o \sigma v i \nu \eta$ is $\sigma v y a-$
 à yà̂̀v (Chrys. Caten. in jöb r.), so àôtkía is the union and accumulation of all that is the reverse ; comp. notes on Tit. ii. 14 .
20. $\delta \hat{\epsilon}$ is certainly not 'for' (Bloomficld), but, with its proper antithetical force, notices a tacit objection which the implied statement in the last clause of the preceding verse, namely, 'that there are Kiotros in the Church of Christ,' might be thought to suggest: this it dilutes by showing it was really in accordance with the counsels and will of God; ' the Chureh is indeed intrinsically holy, but in a large house,' etc.; comp. notes on Gul. iii. 11. The connection and current of the apostle's thought will be best recognized, if it be observed that in ver. 19 the Church is regarded more as an invisible, in the present verse more as a visible community : on the true import and proper application of these terms, sce Jackson, Creed, xi1. 7. 6, and Field, Book of the Church, I. 10, p. 14.
 observe the epithet, and its position, Winer, Gr. § 59. 2, p. 564. The cikia is not the world (Chrys., Theoph ), but, in continuation of the previous imace, the visible Church of Clirist (Cypr. Epp. 55) ; the apostle chancres, howerer, the term $\neg \in \mu$ é $\lambda$ tos, which marked the inward and essential character of the Church,
into oikia, which serves better to portray it in its visible and outward aspect. The Church was $\mu \epsilon \gamma \dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta$, it was like a net of wide sweep ( $\sigma a \gamma \eta \dot{\eta} \nu \eta$, Matth. xiii. 47) that included in it somerhing of every kind ; see especially, Field, Book of the Church, I. 7 sq., p. 11 sq., Pearson, Creed, Art. Ix. Vol. 1. p. 405 (ed Burton), and Hooker, Eccl. Pol. III. 1. 8. $\sigma \kappa \in v$ च $\chi \rho \cup \sigma \bar{a} \kappa . \tau . \lambda$.$] 'vessels of gold$ and silcer:' By this and the following metaphorical expressions the genuine and spurious members of the Church are represented as forming two distinet classes, each of which, as the terms $\chi \rho u \sigma \hat{\alpha}$, à $\rho \gamma u p \hat{a}$ and again $\xi u u^{\lambda}$. and $\grave{\partial} \sigma \tau \rho \alpha ́ \kappa$. seem to imply, may involve different degrees and gradations ; the former the $\sigma \kappa \in \dot{v} \eta$ єis $\tau \mu \dot{\eta} \nu$, who are called by a 'vocatio interna,' and are united in heart to the Church ; the latter the $\sigma \kappa \in v^{\eta} \eta$ єis àrı $\mu i ́ a \nu$, who are called by a 'vocatio mere externa,' and who pertain not to the 'compages domus' (August. de Bapt. vir. 99, - a chapter that will repay consulting), but belong to it merely outwardly and in name ; comp. Jackson, Creed, xir. 7.1 sq., Neander, Planting, Vol. I. p. 492 (Boln), and on the whole subject, esp. the great work of Field, supr. cit., particularly Book I. ch. $6-11$. Thus then the $\tau \iota \mu \dot{\eta}$ and $\dot{a} \tau \mu \mu$ ia have no reference to the honor or dishonor that redound to the oikía or to the oiko $\delta \in \sigma \pi \delta{ }^{\prime} \eta{ }^{2}$ (comp. Mack, Matth.), but, as in Rom. ix. 21 (see Meyer in loc.), simply appertain to, and qualitatively characterize, the vessels themselves. Möller (p. 106) finds in this image thus left to Timothy's spiritual discernment (see ver. 4 sq.) a mark of genuineness ; a forger would have hardly left it thus unexpanded and unexplained.

21 दُà ע o aging and consolatory exhortation, gen-



cral in form, yet not without special reference to Timothy ; ${ }^{2} \alpha \dot{\nu} \nu \tau t s=$ "si quis, verbi gratiâ, Timotheus,' Beng.
$\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{\prime} \kappa \kappa \alpha \hat{N} \alpha \rho \eta$ € $\in \alpha v \tau$.] 'shall have purged himself from,' 'expurgarit,' Beza; not $\pi \alpha \nu \tau \epsilon \lambda \omega \bar{s}$ ка৯̀ $\alpha$ p?, Chrys., but (in sensu prcegnanti) 'purgando sese exierit de numero horum,' Beng., - the $\begin{aligned} & \\ & k\end{aligned}$ referring to those whose communion was to be left, compare verse 19, ámoбтйть. The verb éккал. occurs again in 1 Cor. v. 7, where the force of the prep., in allusion to the 'purging-out' from the houses of the $\pi a \lambda a ı$ Uúun (see Schoettg. Hor. Vol. I. 598), is fully apparent. Theodoret (comp. Chrys.) calls attention to $\tau \hat{\eta} s$
 alpeotv, here fully conveyed by the active verb with the reflexive pronoun (Beng.), and very unconvincingly denied by Beza. On the great practical principle involved in this verse,--' no communion with impugners of fundamentals,' see the sound remarks of Waterland, Doctr. of Trin. ch. iv. Vol. ILI. p. 456 sq.
$\dot{\alpha} \pi \dot{\delta} \tau 0 u ́ \tau \omega \nu$ seems clearly to refer to $\hat{\alpha}$ eis à $\tau \iota \mu \dot{\{ } a \nu$, i.e. the person included in that simile, - not to the $\beta \in \beta$ indous $\kappa \in \nu o-$ фwvias mentioned in ver. 16 (Est.), nor to àotuias, ver. 19 (Coray), which latter seems a very far-fetched reference. In using the terms थ̀ eis àrup, the thoughts of the apostle were in all probability dwelling on the $\psi \in u \delta o \delta i \delta \alpha \sigma_{\kappa} \kappa a \lambda$ а to whom he had been recently alluding.
$\epsilon$ is $\tau \iota \mu \hat{\eta} \nu$ is not to be connected with ท่ $\gamma$ เaбuévov, Syr., Chrys., Lachm., . Leo (who, however, adopts in his text a contrary punctuation), but, as the previous connection in ver. 20 obviously suggests, immediately with $\sigma \kappa \in \hat{v} o s$, the three defining clauses more fully explaining the meaning of the term.


Philem. 11; ăpa èкєiva á $\chi \rho \eta \sigma \tau \alpha$, є! каl
 єủ $\chi$ p $\eta \sigma \tau i a$, as the following clause shows, is 'per opera bona, quibus et suæ et aliorum saluti ac necessitati ad Dei gloriam subserviant,' Estius. $\epsilon$ is $\pi \bar{\alpha} \nu$ 色р үov к. т.入. $\rceil$ 'prepared for every goord work;' eis, as usual, referring to the uiltimate end and objects contemplated in the preparation; compare Rev. ix. 7, and Winer, Gr, § 49. a, p. 354 . Though opportunities might not always present themselves for an exercise of the $\in \tau o \iota \mu \alpha-$ $\sigma^{\prime} \alpha$, yet it was there against the time of
 $\delta \in i o ́ \nu$ é $\sigma \tau \iota, \delta \in \kappa \tau \iota k o ́ v$, Chrys.
 lusts of youth,' ' juvenilia desideria,' Vulgate, Clarom. ; certainly not 'cupiditates novarum rerum,' Salmas, nor 'acres,' 'vehementes cupid.,' Locsner, Obs. p. 417 ; see especially Pearson, Vind. Ign. (ad lect.), Vol. 1. p. 7 sq. (A.-C. Libr.). The previous indirect exhortation is now continued in a direct form both negatively and positively: the $\delta \frac{1}{\epsilon}$ (which must not be omitted as in Auth. Version, Conyb.) marks the contrast between $\nu \in \omega \tau$.

 but as the Greek commentators remark, include $\pi a ̂ \sigma a \nu$ é $\pi เ ง v \nu \mu i ́ a \nu ~ a ̆ т o \pi o \nu ~(C h r y s),$.
 кail rà тоútots $\pi \rho 0 \sigma o ́ \mu o t a ~(T h e o d),. ~ i n ~ a ~$ word, all the lusts and passions which particularly characterize youth, but which of course might be felt by one who is not a youth in the strictest sense of the term. On the comparative youth of Timothy, comp. notes on 1 Tim. v. 12.
סíw $\kappa \in$ ] 'follow after.' So. with the same subst., 1 Tim. vi. 11 ; comp, also Rom. ix. 3031 , xii. 13 , xiv. 19 , 1 Cor. xiv. 1 , 1 Thessal. v. 15 (Heb. xii. 14), where



 xxxiv．15］is used by St．Paul in the same characteristic way with abstract substantives；the correlative term is $\kappa \alpha-$ $\tau \alpha \lambda \alpha \mu \beta \alpha ́ \nu \in เ \nu$, Rom．ix．30，Phil．iii． 12. On סькаıoб．and $\pi i \sigma \tau \iota s$ ，see notes on 1
 $\nu 0 \in i$ ödas $\tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} \dot{\alpha} \rho \in \tau \alpha ́ s$, Coray．
$\epsilon i \rho \eta \dot{\eta} \eta \nu$ mustbe joined with $\mu \in \tau \grave{\alpha} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ غ̇тıкал．，not with $\delta \dot{\prime} \omega \kappa є$ ，Heydenr．：com－
 $\pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \omega \nu$ ．It denotes not merely＇peace＇ in the ordinary sense，$i$ ．e．absence of con－ tention，but＇concordiam illam spiritua－ lem＇（Calv．）which unites together all who call upon（1 Cor．i．2）and who love their Lord ；comp．Rom．x．12，Eph．iv． 3. ${ }^{2} \kappa \kappa \alpha$ Napas $\kappa \alpha \rho \delta$ ．（see notes on 1 Tim．i．5）belongs to ė̃ıka入．т $\grave{\nu} \nu \mathrm{K} \dot{\mathrm{u}} \mathrm{\rho}$ ， and tacitly contrasts the true believers with the false teachers whose кар $\delta i \alpha$ like their voûs and $\sigma v \nu \in$ í $\delta \eta \sigma t s$（Tit．i．15）was not $\kappa \alpha \vartheta a \rho a ́$ ．but $\mu \in \mu z \alpha \sigma \mu \in ́ \nu \eta$ ．

23．$\tau \grave{\alpha} s \mu \omega \rho \dot{\alpha} s \kappa$ ．$\tau . \lambda$ ．］＇the foolish and ignorant questions＇which the false teachers especially love to entertain and propound；compare Tit．iii．9．＇Amaífev－ $\operatorname{\tau os}$（an $\ddot{\alpha}^{\pi} \pi$ ．$\lambda \in \gamma \dot{\delta} \mu$ ．in N．T．）is not ex－ actly＇sine disciplinà，＇Vulg．（compare Syr．），but，in accordance with its usual lexical meaning（Suid．ảvóntos，Hesych． à $\mu a a^{\prime}$ ís），＇indoctus，＇and thence，as here， ＇ineptus，＇＇insulsus，＇Goth．＇dvalôns＇ ［cognate with＇dull＇］：compare Prov． viii． 5, xv．14，and especially Ecclus．x． 3，where Baбı入єús ảmadঠevtos stands in a kind of contrast to крıт $̀$｜s $\sigma o \phi$ ós，ver． 1 ； compare Wincr，Gr：§ 16．3，p． 88.
§ $\eta \tau \eta$＇$\sigma \in \iota s$ ］＇questions（of controversy）；＇ see notes on 1 Tim．i．4．On mapalrồ see notes ib．iv． 7.
$\epsilon i \delta \dot{\omega} s$
 that they enyender contentions；＇compare 1 Tim．vi： $4,{ }^{\epsilon} \xi \xi \bar{\omega} \nu \nu \gamma^{i \nu \epsilon \tau \alpha,} \stackrel{\epsilon}{\epsilon} \rho i s$, Tit．iii．

9，$\mu \dot{\alpha} \chi$ as vouırás．The use of $\mu \dot{\alpha} \chi \eta$ in such applications is more extended than that of $\pi \delta ́ \lambda \epsilon \mu \sigma s$ ；＇dicitur autem $\mu \dot{\alpha} \chi \in \sigma$－ શaı de quîcunque contentione etiam ani－ morum etiamsi non ad verbera et ceedes ［ $\pi \delta \delta \lambda \epsilon \mu 0 \nu$ ］pervenerit，＇Tittm．Synon．I． p． 66 ：compare Eustath．on Hom．Ill．I．
 доүouaxia $\delta \eta \lambda o \hat{\text { in }}$ ．Both terms are joined in James iv．1，but there the conflicts are not，as here，upon abstract questions be－ tween rival teachers or rival sects，but turn upon the rights of property，com－ pare ver． 2,3 ．It neel scarcely be said that $\mu a ́ \chi \eta$ has no connection with AK－or aix $\mu$＇（Pape，Wüterb．s．v．）；the most plausible derivation seems Sanscr．maksh， ＇irasci＇（ $\chi=\mathrm{ksh}$ ），see Benfey，Wurzellex． Vol．11．p． 42 ；＇si recte suspicanur， propria ab initio illi verbo fuit notio con－ tentionis seu impetus quo quis se in alium infert，＇Tittmann，Synon．l．c．

24．$\delta o \hat{v} \lambda o \nu \mathrm{~K} v \rho$ ．］＇$a$ servant（so Copt．）of the Lord，＇－not merely in a general reference（comp．Eph．vi．6， 1 Pet．ii．16），but，as the context seems to require，with a more special reference to Timothy＇s office as a bishop and evange－
 Tit．i．1，James i．1＇，al．
そ̈ $\pi \leftarrow 0 \nu$ ］＇gentle，＇＇mild，＇（＇mitem，＇Cla－ romanus，not very happily changed into ＇mansuctum，＇Vulg．），both in words and demeanor；only found here and（if we adopt the reading of Rec．，Tisch．）in 1 Thess．ii．7，סuvá $\mu \in \nu 0$ ėv $\beta a \rho \in \mathbb{E}$ cìval．．．．．
 ably from＇$Е \Pi \Omega$ ，comp．خ̈тıа ф́а́риака， Hom．Ill．1v．218，al．，with primary ref． perhaps to healing by incantation）ap－ pears to denote an outward mildness and gentleness，especially in bearing with others：＇$\pi \rho$ âos（when not in its specific scriptural sense，compare notes on Eph．


iv．2）ipsam animi lenitatem indicat， ク̈rtos qui hane lenitatem in aliis ferendis monstrat，＇Tittm．Synon．I．p．140．＇The
 and $\phi ь \lambda \alpha \geqslant \rho \rho \omega \pi i a$ in Philo，Vol．Ir．p． 267．$\delta \iota \delta a \kappa \tau \iota \kappa$ óv］＇apt to teach；＇ready to teach rather than con－ tend ：see notes on 1 Tim．iii．2．There seems no reason（with De W．）to give бiбакт．here a different shade of mean－ ing ；the servant of the Lord was not to be merely＇lehrreich，＇but＇lehrhaftig＇ （Luther），ready and willing à $\mu \alpha ́ \chi \omega s ~ \pi \rho o-$

$\dot{\alpha} \nu \in \xi\{\kappa \alpha \kappa o \nu]$＇patient of wrong，＇＇for－
 Hesych．；comp．Wisdom ii．19，where it is in connection with é $\pi \iota \epsilon$ iкє $1 a$ ，and see Dorvill．Charit．viII．4，p． 616.

25．$\pi \rho \alpha$ טै $\tau \eta \tau \downarrow$ ］＇meekiness ：＇see notes on Gal．v．23．and on Eph．iv．2．＇E $\nu$ $\pi \rho a u \hat{r}$ ．is obviously not to be connected with ảveģic．，as Tynd．．Cran．，Gen．，but with the part．，defining the manner in which the $\pi \alpha \iota \delta \in v \in \epsilon \nu$ is to be conducted．
 who are contending agamst hum；＇＇those that are of different opinions from us，＇ Harnmond，＇qui diversam sententiam fuvent，＇Tittmann，－who distinguishes between $\dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \iota \delta$ ．，the perhaps stronger $\dot{\alpha} \nu$－ тьлє́ $\gamma 0 \nu \tau \in s$ ，Tit．i．9，and the more decid－ cd àvziókol；sce Synon．ir．p．9．The allusion is not to positively and wilfully heretical teachers as to the voooouzas $\pi \epsilon \rho$ ？ §ทтท́⿱㇒日ध！s（1 Tim．vi．4），those of weak faith and morbid love of à $\nu \tau \omega \hat{\epsilon} \sigma \in \in$（ The－ od．），and controversial questions．The definite heretic was to be admonished， and，in case of stubbornness，was to be left to himself（Tit．iii．10）；such oppo－ nents as the present were to be dealt with gently，and to be won back to the truth ：compare Neander，Planting，Vol． 1．p． 343 ，note（Bohn）．
$\mu \dot{\eta} \pi$ от є к．$\tau . \lambda$. ．］＇if perchance at any time God might grant to them，＇etc．；＇in the hopes that，＇etc．，see Green，Gramm． p．83．M $\eta$ is here used，somewhat irreg－ ularly，in its dubitative sense ；пoté，with which it is united，is not otiose，but＇ad－ fert suam indefiniti temporis significa－ tionem＇（Klotz，Devar．Vol．II．p．674）， and while marking clearly the complete contingency of the change，still leaves the faint hope that at some time or other such a change may，by God＇s grace，be



 Chrys The optative $\delta \psi^{\prime} \eta$（see notes on Eph．i．17），with $\mathrm{ACD}^{1} \mathrm{EG}$ ，al．，is not here treated simply as a subjunctive （Wiesing．），but seems used to convey an expression of hope and subjective pos－ sibility ；compare Winer，Gr．§ 42，4．c， p．346．On the construction of the dubi－ tative $\mu$＇，see the good article in Rost $u$ ． Palm，Lex．s．v．c，Vol．11．p．226，and on $\mu \dot{\eta} \pi о т \epsilon$ ，compare Viger，Idiot．p．457， but observe that the comment is not by Hermann，as cited by Alford in loc．
$\mu \in \tau \alpha$＇ $0, \alpha \nu$ ］＇repentance，＇－certainly not＇conversion from paganism to Chris－ tianity＇（Reuss，Théol．Chrét．1v．16， Vol．II．p．163），but＇poenitentiam＇in its usual and proper sense，scil．an à áó $\sigma \tau \alpha-$
 $\Theta \in \dot{\partial} \nu$（see especially Taylor on Repent．II． 1）．a change of heart wrought by God＇s grace within．It may be observed that $\mu \in t a v o ́ \epsilon \omega$（only 2 Cor．xii．21）and $\mu \in \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha}$－ vola（only Rom．ii．4， 2 Cor．vii．9，10） occur less frequently in St．Paul＇s Epis－ tles than we might otherwise have imag－ ined，being not unfrequently partially
 terms peculiar to the apostle ；see Usteri， Lehrb．11．1．1，p．102，and comp．Tay－

#   

lor, Repent. II. 2. 11. $\quad \epsilon \pi \dot{\gamma} \nu \omega$ $\sigma \iota \nu \quad \dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta$ १.] '(full) knowledge of the truth,' i. e. of gospel-truth, Beza: the Gospel is the Truth $\kappa a \tau^{\prime}{ }^{\xi} \xi \xi_{0} \neq \eta$, it contains all the principles and elements of practicul truth; see Reusss Theol. Chret. iv. 8, Vol. II. p. 82. The omission of the article before $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \eta$ tifas is due to the principle of correlation, the article before $\epsilon \operatorname{\epsilon } \pi i \gamma \nu$. being omitted in consequence of the prep. ; sce Middleton, Art. ini. 3. 7, p. 49 (ed. Rose).
$26 \kappa a l$ ả $\nu \alpha \nu$ ウ $\psi \omega \sigma \iota \nu \kappa . \tau . \lambda] ~ ' a n d$. they may return to soberness out of the snare of the devil, being held captive by him to do His [God's] will.' The difficulty of this verse rests entirely in the construction. Of the various interpretations, three deserve consideration ; (a) that of Auth. Ver., Vulg., Syr. (apparently), followed by De W., Huth., Alf., and the majority of modern commentators, according to which aúroû and èkeivou both refer to the тô̂ ôcaßó入ou ; (b) that of Wetst., Beng., al., according to which aùtoû is referred to the סov̂̀os Kup., ėkeivou to God, and $\dot{\epsilon}\left(\omega \gamma \rho \eta \mu \epsilon{ }^{\prime} \nu 0<\right.$ to the spiritual capture and reclaiming of sinners, Luke v. 10, comp. 2 Cor. x. 5 ; (c) that of Beza, Grotius, Hammond, and appy. Clarom. (' co..... ipsius ') according to which d̀vav....tayi$\delta o s$ is to be connected with eis $\tau \delta$ èk গิ' $\lambda$. ; aùzoû referring to the devil, ékeivou to God, and é'swyp. ن́ $\pi$ ' aùvov̂ being an explanatory clause to àvav. є̇к $\pi a \gamma$. (almost, ' ihough held captive,' etc. ), marking more distinctly the state preceding the à $\nu \mathrm{d} \nu \eta$ $\psi$ is. Of these ( $\alpha$ ) labors under the almost insurmountable objection of referring the two pronouns to the same subject especially when a few verses below, ch. iii. 9, they are used correctly. De W. and his followers imperfectly quote Plato, Cratyl. p. 430 E, as an instance of a similar use of the pronouns, but if the
passage be properly cited, :e. g. $\pi \rho \sigma \sigma \in \lambda-$

 it will be seen that the antithesis of the last clause (omitted by De W.), suggests some reasons for the irregular introduction of the more emphatic pronoun, the other instances referred to in Kühner, Gr. § 629 (add Bernhardy, Synt. vi. 5, p 277), in which ėкeiv. precedes and aủ$\tau \delta s$ follows, do not apply. The sense, moreover, conveyed by this interpretation is singularly flat and insipid. The objections to (b) are equally strong, for
 Theoph.), which marks the act (compare $\delta \omega_{n}$ ảvavn่ $\psi$.), would certainly have been used rather than the perfect part. which marks the state: and 2 ndly, aủroû is separated from its subject by two interposed substantives, with either of which (grammatically considered) the connection would have seemed more natural and perspicuous. The only serious objection to $(c)$ is the isolation of $\bar{\xi} \varsigma \omega \gamma \rho$. vim' $\alpha \dot{u} \tau o \hat{v}$; this, however, may be diluted by observing that the simile involved in $\pi a \gamma$ is did seem to require a semi-parenthetical illustration. As, then, (c) yields a very good sense, as àvay....eis is similar and. symmetrical to $\mu \in T$ ávotav eis èmíyv, as the force of the perfect is unimpaired and the 'proprietas utriusque pronominis' (Beza) is thus fully preserved, we adopt, with but little hesitation, the last interpretation: see Hammond in loc., and Scholef. Hints, p. 123 (ed. 3). We now notice a few individual expressions. $\dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha \nu \dot{\eta} \phi \in \iota \nu$, an $\dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha \xi \lambda \in \gamma \delta \mu$. in the N . I. (compare however, ėк $\kappa \dot{\eta} \phi \in \iota \nu, 1$ Cor. xv. 34), implies 'a recovering from drunkenness to a state of former sobriety,' 'crapulam excutere' (Porphyr. de Abst. Iv. 20, є̇к $\left.\tau \hat{\eta} s \mu^{\prime} \hat{\prime} \vartheta \eta s \dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha \nu \eta \dot{\eta} \psi a \iota\right)$, and thence metaphorically 'ad se redire,' e.g.

In the last days there shall be every form of vice．A－ void all examples of such ： they ever strive to seduce otiers and thwart the truth．



1．$\left.\gamma^{\prime} \nu \omega \sigma \kappa \epsilon\right]$ Lachm．reads $\gamma \boldsymbol{\imath} \nu \omega \sigma \kappa \epsilon \tau \epsilon$ with AFG； 3 mss ．；Boern．，压th．－Pol．； Aug．（Tisch．ed．1，Huther）．Being a more diffeult reading，it has some claim on our attention ；as however the reading of the text is so strongly supported－viz．by CDEKL ；nearly all mss．；Syr，Vulg．，Clarom，Sangerm．，Aug．，Copt．，在th．－ Platt，Goth．，al．；several Greek and Latin Ff．（Rec．，G＇riesb．，De W．，Alf．，Wordsw．） －and as it is possible that the following öt may have given rise to the reading ［ $\gamma$ iv $\omega \sigma \kappa \in$ öтt being changed by an ignorant or carcless writer into $\gamma \iota \nu \omega ̈ \sigma \kappa \epsilon \epsilon$ ］，it would seem that Tisch．（ed．2，7）has rightly reversed his former opinion．
$\epsilon^{\epsilon} \kappa \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ शेph̀ $\nu \omega \nu$ ，Joseph．Antiq．vi．11． 10 ； see further examples in Wetst．，Kypke， and Elsuer in loc．There is apparently slight confusion of metaphor，but it may be observed that $\dot{\alpha} \nu a \nu$ ．$e^{2} \kappa \pi \alpha \gamma^{\prime} \overline{\delta o s}$ is really a＇constructio pregnans，＇scil．＇come to soberness and escape from，＇see Winer， （ ${ }^{\gamma} r$ r．§ 66．2，p． $54 \bar{\imath}$ ．$\quad \zeta \omega \gamma \rho \in \hat{\imath} \nu$ is properly＇to capture alive＇$(\zeta \omega \gamma \rho \in \hat{i}$ ． §（ivvтas $\lambda \alpha \mu \beta a ́ \nu \in t$ ，Suid．），e．g．Polyl）．Hist． 111．84．10，$\delta \in \dot{́} \mu \in \nu 0 \iota \zeta \omega \gamma \rho \in \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\nu}$ ，in contrast
 Thucyd．Hist．II．92，al．；thence＇to capture，＇in an ethical sense，Luke v．10， －but even there not without some allu－ sive reference to the primary meaning； see Meyer in loc．In the LXX．it is used several times in the sense of＂in vitâ ser－ vare＇（Heb．ה．ñ），Josh．vi．25，Numb． גxxi．15，al．；＂ümp．Hom．1l．x．576， and see Suicer，Thesaur．s．v．Vol．ı．p． 1302.
$\tau 0 \hat{v} \delta \iota \alpha \beta \delta \lambda o \nu]$
See 1 Tim．iii． 7 ；and on the use of the term $\delta$ sáß．，see notes on $E p h$ ．iv． 27.

Cimapter III．1．toovto $\delta \hat{\text { è }}]$ The $\delta \hat{\epsilon}$ is not $\mu \epsilon \tau a \beta a t ⿺ 𠃊 \delta \nu$ ，but continues the subject implied in ch．ii． 26 ，in an anti－ thetical relation ：ver． 26 mainly referred to the present and to recovery from Sa － tan＇s snare ；ver． 1 sq．refers to the future and to a further progress in iniquity． $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \dot{\nu} \sigma \chi \dot{\alpha} \tau \alpha, s \dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon \in \alpha, s]$＇in the last dirys，＇the last period of the Christian era，the times preceding the end，not
merely＇at the conclusion of the Jewish state＇（Waterland，Serm．III．Vol．v．p． 546），but at a period more definitely fu－ ture（ $\dot{v} \sigma \tau \in \rho \circ \nu \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \delta \dot{\beta} \mu \nu \circ \nu$, Chrys．），as the
 gest ；compare 1 Pet．i．5， 2 Pet．iii．3， Jude 18，and see notes on 1 Tim．iv． 1. It would seem，however，clear from ver． 5 ，that the evil was beginning to work even in the days of Timothy；see Bull， Serm．xv．p． 276 （Oxford，1844）．On the omission of the article，compare Wi－ ner，Gr．$\$ 19$, p．113，where a list is given of similar＇words found frequently anar－ throus．$\left.\quad \dot{\theta} \nu \sigma \tau \dot{\eta} \sigma \circ \nu \tau \alpha L^{\prime}\right]$ ＇will ensue，＇＇will set in ；＇not＇immine－ bunt，＇but＇aderunt．＇Bengel， $0^{2} 2 \mathbf{I N}_{x}$ ［venient］Syr．，i．e．will become present （ ${ }^{2} \nu \in \sigma \tau \bar{\omega} \tau \epsilon s$ ）；see notes on Gal．i．4．De Wette objects to Vulg．＇instabunt＇［ad－ venient，Clarom．］，but＇instare＇appears frequently used in Latin to denote pres－ ent time，comp．Cic．Tusc．Iv．6，and es－ pecially Auct．ad Herenn．11．5，＇dividitur ［tempus］in tempora tria，preteritum， instans，consequens．＇It is possible that the choice of the word may have been suggested by the apostle＇s prophetic knowledge，that the evil which was more definitely to work in times farther future was now beginning to develop itself even in the early days of the Gospel ；＇̇otiv
 $\dot{a} \pi \delta \delta \sigma \tau 0 \lambda o s$, Theodoret：comp． 2 Thess．



## ii． 7.

K人เpol $\chi \alpha \lambda \in \pi$ о 1$]$ ＇difficult，grierous，times ；＇not merely in respect of the outward dangers they might involve（＇periculosa，＇Vulg ），but the evils that marked them ；où $\chi^{l}$ tàs

 Chrysost．；compare Gal．i．4，aiùv tovn－ pós，Eph．v．16，ìmépal тovppail．The $\chi^{a} \lambda \epsilon \pi \delta \tau \eta s$ of the times would be felt in the embarrassment in which a Christian might be placed how to act（＇ubi wix reperias，quid agas，＇Beng．），and how to confront the various spiritual and tempo－ ral dangers of the days in which he was living；comp． 2 Macc．iv． $16, \pi \epsilon \rho \dot{\epsilon} \epsilon \sigma \in \nu$

2 of ă $\nu$ จ $\rho \omega \pi 0$ 亿］＇men，generally：＇ the article must not be overlooked；it does not point merely to those of whom the apostle is speaking（Mack），but clear－ ly implies that the majority of men should at that time be such as he is about to de－ scribe．
$\phi$＇\｛aviot］＇lovers of self；＇an äm $\lambda \in \gamma^{\circ} \mu$ ．in the N．T．，de－ fined by Thieod．Mops，as oi $\pi$ ávea $\pi \rho \partial_{s}$
 be observed that фidautía properly occu－ pies this $\pi$ pocópia in the enumeration，be－ ing the repressor of $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \dot{\alpha} \pi \eta \eta$（ $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \dot{\alpha} \gamma$ ．$\sigma \nu \sigma-$
 true root of all eril，and the essence of all sin ；see cespecially Müller，Doctr．of Sin，1 1．3，Yol．1．p． 136 sq．（Clark）， and for an able delineation of its nature and specifie forms，Barrow，Serm．Lx．－ Lxiri．Vol．iif．p． 333 sq．and Water－ land，Serm．iII．Vol．v p 446 sq．On фiddpyvpon，which here very appropriately follows фíaqutou（pirapyupía הuydínp $\tau$ îs фidautias，Coray），comp．notes on 1 Tin． vi． 10
$\dot{\alpha} \lambda \alpha \zeta \delta \nu \in S, v i \pi \in \rho \dot{\eta}-$ фavot！＇boastful，haughty，＇Rom．i．30， whese $\hat{v} \beta$ piatal is also added．The dis－ tinction between these terms（＇à $\lambda a S_{o v e ́ i a ~}^{a}$
in verbis magis est，ostentatio，$\dot{\pi} \pi \rho \eta \eta$ 位ía， superbia，cum aliorum contemtu et con－ tumelia conjuncta，＇Tittm．）is investigat－ ed by Trench，Synon．§ 29，and Tittm． Synon．I．p．73．The derivation of the latter word is to a certain extent preserv－ ed in the Syr．$\ddot{-} \operatorname{Son}_{0}^{\circ}$［alti］，the Latin ＇superbi，＇and the English＇haughty．＇ In the case of the former word，the trans－ lation of the Vulgate＇clati＇＇［fastidiosi， Clarom．］，is judiciously changed by Bc－ za into＇gloriosi．＇See notes to Transl． $\beta \lambda \alpha \sigma \phi \eta \mu 01]$＇Ulasphemers，＇or＇evil speakers，＇katךүopiaus $\chi$ aipovess，Theod．－ Mops．；most probably the former，both ＇vi ordinis＇（Calov．），and because $\delta$ óáßo－入ot follows in ver． 3 ；compare notes on
 the mind（see Trench，l．c．），develops itsclf still more fearfully in $\ddot{\sim} \beta p / s$ against

 The transition to the following clause is thus also very natural and appropri－ ate ；they alike reviled their heavenly father，and disobeyed their earthly pa－ rents．
à $\chi \dot{\alpha} \rho ı \sigma \tau 0$ l］（Luke vi．35）naturally follow ；ingratitude must necessarily be found where there is

 On àvóroos，sce notes on 1 Tïm．i． 9.
3．¿̌ $\sigma$ Toproi］＇without natural affec－ tion ；＇ $\begin{aligned} & \text { its } \lambda \in \gamma \delta \mu \text { ，here and Rom．i．} 31 \text { ；} \\ & \text { ，}\end{aligned}$


 oincious，－destitute of love towards those for who：nature herself claims it．$\Sigma \tau \notin \rho-$ $\gamma \omega$, a word of uncertain derivation［pos－ sidly connected with $\sigma \tau \epsilon \rho$ ，and Sanscr． sprih，＇desiderare，＇Pott，Etym．Forsch． Vol．1．p．284］，denotes primarily and properly the love between parents and


children（compare Plato，Legg．vi．p． 754 B；Xenoph．（Econ．vir．54），and thence between those connected by similar or parallel relations．Like áyand́a（the usual word in the N．T．）it is rarely used in good authors of mere sensual love． It does not oseur in the N．T．or LXX．； only Ecclus．xxvii．17，$\sigma \tau \epsilon ́ \rho \xi=\nu$ фí入ov （Ecclus．viii．20，is more than doubtful）． ä $\sigma \pi 0 \nu \delta 0$ l］＇implacable；＇in är．$\lambda \epsilon-$ $\gamma \delta \mu_{\text {．，—Rom．i．} 31 \text {（Rec．）being of doubt－}}$ ful authority．The difference between
 stated by Tittm．，Synon．1．p．75，＇àov́và． qui non ineunt pacta，ä $\sigma \pi$ ．qui redire in gratiam nolunt，＇is lexically doubtful． The former seems to denote one who does not abide by the compacts into which he has entered，$\mu \eta$＇̇ $\mu \mu \epsilon \in \nu \omega \nu$ тaîs $\sigma \nu \nu,{ }^{\prime} \eta \eta^{-}$ кals，Hesych．（comp．Jerem．iii．8， 10 ； Demosth．Fals．Leg．p．383，connected with $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} \mu \eta \tau o s) ; ~ ぬ ँ \sigma \pi o \nu \delta o s, ~ o n e ~ w h o ~$ will not enter upon them at all．This and the foregoing epithet are omitted in Syr．On $\delta$ ıáßoдos compare notes on 1 Tim．iii． 11.
d $\kappa \rho \alpha \tau \in \hat{i} s]$ ＇incontinent，＇$\eta_{\tau \tau ⿱ 亠 ⿻ ⿰ 丨 丨 八 夊 力} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \alpha \hat{\omega} \nu$ ，Theod：－ Mops．，＇intemperantes，＇Beza；д̈л．$\lambda \epsilon-$ $\gamma \delta \mu$ ：the opposite é $\gamma \kappa \rho a \tau \eta{ }^{\prime} s$ occurs Tit． i．8．The subst．àkpaбía（Lobeck，Phryn． p．524）occurs 1 Cor，vii． 7.
à $\nu$ ク＇$\mu \in \rho \circ$ i］＇surage，＇＇brutal，＇literally ＇untamed，＇är．$\lambda \epsilon \gamma \delta \mu$ ．；ìńpta à $\nu \tau \grave{\downarrow}$ à $\nu$－ సิp $\dot{\sigma} \pi \omega \nu$ ，Theophylact，compare Syriac $\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{i}}^{\mathrm{mor}} \mathrm{z}_{\mathrm{x}} \mathrm{V}^{\mathrm{D}}$［feri］：＇ungentle＇（Peile）， seems far too mild a translation，$\dot{\omega} \mu \dot{\tau} \tau \eta s$ and $\alpha \pi \not \approx \eta \nu \in \iota a($ Chrysost．，comp．©cum．） are rather the characteristics of the $\alpha, \eta^{\prime}-$ $\mu \in \rho o s$ ．

 ©cum．，Theoph．；another $\ddot{\alpha} \pi$ ．$\lambda \in \gamma \delta \mu$ ．： the opposite $\phi \stackrel{\text { ®árañot occurs Tit．i．8，}}{\text { ，}}$ where see notes ；compare Wisd．vii． 22. It does not seem necessary，with Beza
and Auth．Ver．，to limit the ref．to persons， either here or Tit．l．c．；comp．Suic．，Thes． Vol．II．p．1426．So appy．Goth．＇unsêl－ jái＇［cogn．with＇selig＇］，Vulg．，Clarom．， ＇sine benignitate，＇and，as far as we can infer from the absence of any studied ref． to persons，Syr，Arm．，Copt．，Ethiop． These are cases in which the best an－ cient V v ．may be profitably consulted．

4．$\pi \rho$ o $\delta \delta$＇$\tau \alpha t$ ］＇betrayers，＇most prob－ ably of their（Christian）brethren and friends；троôótà фı入ías ка．étaıpeías， ©cum．：compare Luke vi．16，Acts vii． 52．$\pi \rho o \pi \in \tau \in i s]$＇head－ strong，＇headlong in action，－not merely in words（Suid．$\pi \rho o \pi \in \tau \eta{ }^{\prime} s$, ó $\left.\pi \rho o ́ \gamma \lambda \omega \sigma \sigma o s\right)$ ， or in thoughts（comp．Hesych．，$\pi \rho \delta$ тoû $\lambda o \gamma เ \sigma \mu \circ \hat{v})$ ；see Acts xix．36，$\mu \eta \delta \delta_{\epsilon ́ v}^{\nu} \pi \rho 0-$ $\pi \epsilon \tau \in ̀ s \quad \pi \rho \alpha ́ r \tau \epsilon L \nu$ ，and compare Herodian，

 partial synonym $\pi \rho o a \lambda h s$, Ecclus．xxx． 8 ，is condemned in its adverbial use by Phryn．p． 245 （ed．Lob．），and Thom．M． p． 744 （ed．Bern．）．On $\tau \in \tau \cup \phi \omega \mu$ évol，see notes on 1 Tim．iii． 6.
 rather than lovers of God；＇both words $\ddot{\alpha} \pi$ ．$\lambda \epsilon \gamma \delta \mu$ ．in the N．T．Wetstein cites very appositely Philo，de Agricull．§ 19， Vol．I．p． 313 （ed．Mang．），фı $\lambda$ ifjovov каi
 épráo $\eta \tau a l$ ．
 （outward）form of godliness，＇$\dot{\circ}$ ［ $\sigma \chi \hat{\eta} \mu \alpha]$ Syr．＇speciem pietatis，＇Vulg．， Clarom．；$\mu \dot{\rho} \rho \phi \omega \sigma \omega \nu$ ，ă $\psi \nu \chi$ оу каl עєкро́v，
 $\delta \eta \lambda o u ̄ \nu$ ．Chrys．Mópф $\quad \sigma$ ts occurs again in Rom．ii．20，but，as Chrys rightly ob－ serves，in a different application ；here， as the context clearly shows，it implies the mere outward form as opposed to the inward and pervading influence（ $\delta \dot{v} \nu a \mu$ ts）．



The more correct word would be $\mu$ ó $\rho \phi \omega$ $\mu a$, (Nsch. Agam. 873, Eum. 412), $\mu$ ópфंबढts being properly active, e. g. $\sigma \chi \eta \mu \alpha-$
 phrast. Cuus. Plant. IIr. 7. 4.: there is, however, a tendency in the N. T., as in later writers, to replace the verbal nouns in $-\mu \alpha$ by the corresponding nouns in - $\sigma t s$; compare ìmoтút $\omega \sigma t s$, chap. i. 13. For a plausible distinction between $\mu \rho \rho-$ $\phi \grave{\eta}$ and $\sigma \chi \hat{\eta} \mu a$, the former as what is ' intrinsic' and 'essential,' the latter as what is 'outward' and 'accidental,' - hence $\mu \dot{\rho} \rho \phi \omega \sigma$ s here (an aiming at, affecting, $\mu о \rho \phi \grave{\eta})$ not $\mu о \rho \phi \eta_{n}$, see Lightfoot in Journ. Class. Philol. No. 7, p. 115. On the meaning of $\epsilon \dot{\jmath} \sigma \epsilon \in \beta \epsilon \iota$, see notes on 1 Tim. ii. 2.

This enumeration of vices may be compared with Rom. i. 29 sq., though there absolute heathenism is described, where here the reference is rather to a kind of heathen Christianity ; both lists, however, have, as indeed might well be imagined, several terms in common. The various attempts to portion out these vices into groups (compare Peile) scem all unsuccessful; a certain connection may be observed, in some parts, e. g. à $\lambda \alpha$ ̧̧óves к. т. $\lambda_{0}$, $\beta \lambda a ́ \sigma \phi \eta \mu о \iota$ $\kappa$. $\tau . \lambda$., but it seems so evidently in other parts to give way to similarity in sound or similarity of composition (e.g. $\pi \rho o \delta .$, $\pi \rho о \pi$.$) , that no practical inferences can$ safely be drawn.
$\tau \eta \nu \nu \delta$ ̀े
iv' $\nu a \mu \iota \nu$ к. $\tau . \lambda$.] 'but having denied the power thereof.' 'To deny the power of godliness, is for a man by indecent and vicious actions to contradict his outward show and profession of godliness,' Bull, Serm. xv. p. 279 (Oxford, 1844) : compare Tit. i. 16. The term $\delta \dot{v} v a \mu s$ appears to mark the 'practical influence' which ought to pervade and animate the $\epsilon \dot{v} \sigma \in \in \in \epsilon \alpha$; compare 1 Cor. iv. 20. On the character depicted in this and the
preceding clauses see a striking Sermon by Bp. Hall, Serm. xxviri. Vol. v. p. 366 (Oxf. 1837).

каl toúTovs à $\pi$ orp $\rho$ ] 'from these turn away.' The ral scems here to retain its proper force by specifying those particularly who were to be avoided; there were some of whom hopes might be entertained (ch. ii. 25), these, however, belonged to a far more depraved class, on whom instruction would be thrown away, and who were the melancholy types of the more developed mystery of iniquity of the future ; ' $\kappa a l$ ponimus si duas personas taciti contendimus,' Klotz, Devar. Vol, Ir. p. 636, - by whom this and similar usages of $\kappa$ al are well illustrated. Heydenr. seems to have missed this prelusive and prophetic reference, when he applies all the evil characteristics abovementioned, specially and particularly to the erroneous teachers of the present: these latter, as the following verses show, had many evil elements in common with them, but the two classes were not identical. 'Aтотрє́ $\pi$. (an ä $\pi$. $\lambda \in \gamma \delta \mu$.) is nearly synonymous with ékrрé $\pi$., 1 Tim. vi. 20, and joined similarly with an accusative.
6. $\epsilon \kappa \tau$ оú $\tau \omega \nu \gamma \alpha{ }^{\prime} \rho$ ] The $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho($ not to be omitted in translation, as Conyb., al.) serves clearly and distinctly to connect the future and the present. The seeds of all these evils were germinating even at the present time ; and Timothy, by being suppliced with criteria derived from the developed future (some, indeed, of which, ĕ $\chi o \nu \tau \epsilon s ~ \mu \delta ́ p \phi \omega \sigma เ \nu ~ \kappa . ~ \tau . ~ \lambda ., ~ a p p l i e d ~$ obviously enough to the teachers of his own days), was to be warned in regard of the developing present : comp. Chrys. in loc. There is thus no reason whatever with Grot. to consider cioiv a 'præs. pro futuro.'
$\left.\epsilon^{\epsilon} \nu \delta \dot{v} \nu \circ \nu \tau \in s\right]$ 'creeping into,' like serpents (Möller), or wolves into a fold (Coray) ; $\epsilon i \delta \epsilon s$ $\tau \delta$



 кetav; Chrysost. : compare Jude $4, \pi \alpha-$ $\rho \in \sigma \in$ 'ivorav, where the covertness and firrtive character of the intrusive teachers is yet more fully marked. The verb is (in this sense) an $\ddot{q}^{\prime} \pi$. $\lambda \in \gamma \delta \mu$. in the N . T., but used sufficiently often in classical Greek in similar meanings, both with єis, e. g. Aristoph. Vesp. 1020, è $\nu \delta$. єis raotépas, and with a simple dative, Xenoph. Cyr. II. 1. 13, ėvס. тaîs $\psi v \chi a i ̂ s ~ \tau \omega ิ \nu ~$ àкоvóvт $\omega \nu$. $\quad \alpha i \chi \mu \alpha \lambda \omega \tau$ íSovies] 'leading captive;' Luke xxi. 24, Rom. vii. 23, 2 Cor. x. 5. This verb is usually specified as one of those words in the N. T. which have been thought to be of Alexandrian or Macedonian origin ; compare Fischer, Prolus. xxi. 2, p. 693 : it is condemned by the Atticists (Thom. M. p. 23, ed. Bern., Lobeck, Pliryn. p. 442), the Attic expression being aixua$\lambda \omega \tau o \nu \pi o t \omega$. Examples of the use of the word in Joseph., Arrian, etc, are given in the notes on Thom. Mag. l. c.
$\gamma \nu \nu \alpha \iota \kappa \alpha \rho \iota \alpha]$ 'silly women, 'mulierculas' Vulg., 'kvineina' [literally 'mulicbria,' an abstract neut.], Goth.; the diminutive expressing contempt, $\gamma u v a \iota \kappa \omega ิ v$
 $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha}$ रuvauкаíwv, Chrysost.: compare àvঠpápta, Aristoph. Acharn. 517, åvจ̊p tápta, ib. Plut. 416. The mention of women in connection with the false teachers is, as might be imagined, not passed over by those who attack the genuineness of this Epistle ; compare Baur, Pastoralbr. p. 36. That the Gnostics of the second and third centuries made use of women in the dissemination of their heresies is a mere matter of history ; comp. Epiphan. Heer. xxvi. 11, àmatêvtes r̀
 Iren. Her. I. 13. 3, al. Are we, however, hastily to conclude that a course of
actions, which was in effect as old as the fall of man ( 1 Tim. ii. 14), belonged only to the Gnostic era, and was not also successfully practised in the apostolic age? Heinsius and Elsner notice the somewhat similar course attributed to the Pharisees, Joseph. Antiq. xvir. 2. 4. Justiniani adduces a vigorous passage of Jerome, (Epist. ud Ctesiph. 133. 4) on the female associates of heresiarehs, which is, however, too long for citation.
$\sigma \in \sigma \omega \rho \in \nu \mu \epsilon \in \nu a]$ 'laden, up-heaped with :' the verb $\sigma \omega \rho \in \dot{v} \epsilon i \nu$ (connected probably with $\sigma o p o \partial s$ ) occurs again, in a quotation, Rom. xii. 20, and forcibly depicts $\tau \delta$
 бvүкєұu $\mu$ évov, Chrysost. On the instrumental dative in connection with $\nless \gamma \in \sigma-$ Fal, see notes on Gal. v. 18, and on the form токкínos [ПIK-, connected with $\pi t$ reós], see Donalds: Cratyl. § 266, Pott, Etymol. Forsch. Vol II. p. 600.
7. $\pi \alpha$ áv отє $\mu \alpha \nu$ จे.] 'ever learning,' - not necessarily 'in conventibus Christianorum' (Grot.), but from any who will undertake to teach them. It was no love of truth that impelled them to learn, but only a morbid love of novelty; ' pre curiositate et instabilitate animi semper nova querunt, eaque suis desideriis accommoda,' Estius.
$\kappa$ к ${ }^{\prime} \mu \eta \delta \dot{\epsilon} \pi$. к. т. $\lambda$.] 'and yet never able to come to the (true) knowledge of the truth;' compare notes on verse 11, where the faint antithetic force of $\kappa \alpha l$ is more strongly marked. The $\delta v \nu \alpha ́ \mu \in \nu \alpha$ is not without some significance; in their better moments they might endeavor to attain to some knowledge of the truth, but they
 The conditional negative $\mu \eta \delta \dot{\epsilon} \pi$. is used with the participle, as the circumstance of their inability to attain the truth is stated not as an absolute fact, but as a subsequent characteristic of their class,

## 


and of the results which it led to ; though they were constantly learning, and a knowledge of the truth might have been ultimately expected, yet they never did attain to it: sce Winer, Gr. § 59. 5, p. 428 , and the copious list of examples in Gayler, Partic. Neg. ch. Ix. p. 284 sq. In estimating, however, the force of $\mu \eta$ with participles in the N. T., it must not be forgotten that this usage is the prevailing one of the sacred Writers ; see Green, G'r. p. 122. The subject generally is largely illustrated by Gayler, chap. Ix., but it is much to be regretted that a work so affluent in examples should often be so deficient in perspicuity. On
 Tim. ii. 4.
8. 'I $\alpha \nu \nu \hat{\eta} s \kappa \alpha\{$ ' $I \alpha \mu \beta \rho \hat{\eta} s$ ] 'Jannes and Jambres ;' тà тоútuv òvó $\mu a \tau \alpha$ oủk ėк

 סiбaoka入ius, Theod. in loc. Jannes and Jambres ['I $\omega \alpha ́ \nu \nu \eta s \mathrm{C}^{1}$, and Ma $\mu \beta \rho \hat{\rho} s \mathrm{FG}$; Vulg., al.], according to ancient Hebrew tradition, were chief among the magicians who opposed Moses (Exodus vii.

 Numenius in Orig. Cels. Iv. 51 ; sce Targ. Jon. on Exod. i. 15, and vii. 11, and comp. Euseb. Preep. Ix. 8. They are further said to have been the sons of Balam, and to have perished either in the Red Sea, or at the slaughter after the worship of the golden calf; see the numerous passages cited by Wetstein in loc. It is thus probable that the apostle derived these names from a current and (being quoted by him) true tradition of the Jewish Church. The supposition of Origen (Comment. in Mutth. § 117, Vol. 111. p. 916 , ed. Bened.) that the names were derived from an apocryphal work called 'Jamnis et Mambris Liber,' cannot be
substantiated. Objections urged against the introduction of these names, when gravely considered, will be found of no weight whatever; why was the inspired apostle not to remind Timothy of the ancient traditions of his country, and to cite two names which there is every reason to suppose were too closely connected with the early history of the nation to be easily forgotten? Eor further references see Spencer's note on Orig. Celsus l.c., and for literary notices, etc., Winer, RWB. Art. 'Jambres,' Vol. I. p. 535. There is a special treatise on the subject by J. G. Michaelis, 4to, Hal. 1747.
 also withstand the truth.' The points of comparison between the false and depraved teachers of the present, and the sorcerers of the past, consist in (a) an
 à $\lambda \eta \mathfrak{\jmath}$ єía (comp. Acts xiii. 8, à $\nu \hat{\nu}$ İ $\sigma \tau a \tau o$ aủtois 'E入v́mas), and ( $\delta$ ) the profitless character of that opposition, and notorious betrayal of their folly; ävosa àjrav
 At the same time, without insisting on a further ' tertium comparationis,' it is certainly consistent both with the present context (compare $\gamma \delta \eta \tau \tau \in s$ ver, 13) and with other passages of Scripture (e.g. Acts viii. 9 sq., xiii. 6 sq., xix. 13,19 ) to assume that, like Jannes and Jambres, these false teachers were permitted to avail themselves of occult powers incommunicable and inaccessible to others; see Wiesinger in loc., and comp. Neander, Planting, Vol. 1. p. 216, note.
 rupted in thein mends ;' compare 1 Tim. vi. $5, \delta \iota \epsilon \phi \hat{\imath} \alpha \mu$. $\tau \delta \partial \nu \nu 0 \hat{v} \nu$, and see notes and references. The clause marks the utter moral depravation of these unhappy men ; their voûs (the human spirit viewed both in its intellectual and moral as-

#   є̈кঠŋخ 

Thou knowest alike my faith and sufferings. Evil<br><br>men shall increase, but do thou hold fast to the Holy Scriptures, which will make thee wise and perfect.

 (Lachm., Huther, Wiesing., Lco, Alf.). In his 2nd and $\boldsymbol{\text { th }}$ editions. Tisch. adopts тарךколои́Э७каs with DEKL; appy. nearly all mss. ; Chrys., Theorloret, Dam., al. (Rec., Gricsl., Scholz, Wordsw.). The change does not seem for the better. The external evidence is perhaps slightly in favor of the perfect, but internal evidence scems certainly in favor of the aorist ; for in the first place, as mapךкод. is a noticeable word, it is not very unlikely that a remembrance of the perf. in I Tim. iv. 6 might have suggested an alteration in the present verse ; and again, the hortatory tone of the chapter (comp. v. 5, 14) seems most in hamony with the aor. The perfect would imply that the conduct of Timothy noticed in v .10 sq . was continuing the same ('argmmento utitur ad incitandun Timotheum,' Calv.); the aorist, on the contrary, by drawing attention to the past, and being silent as to the present (iee notes on 1 Thess. ii. 16), suggests the latent exhortation to be careful to act now as then.
pects, Delitzsch, Bibl. Psychol. Iv. 15, p. $244)$ is corrupted, the medium of communication with the Holy Spirit of God polluted : the light that is within is becoming, if not actually become, darkness; compare Eph. iv. 17 sq., and notes in loc. The difference between the compounds $\delta \iota a \phi$ ง. ( $1 \mathrm{Tim} . l . c$.) and катафง. is very slight; both are intensive, the former pointing perhaps more to the pervasive nature, the latter to the prostrating character of the $\phi$ Nopá. So somewhat similarly Zonaras, катaфগopá, ŋ̀ $\pi a \nu \tau \epsilon-$



む $\delta \delta \kappa \iota \mu 01$ к. т. $\lambda$.$] 'reprobate concern-$ ing the faith;' unapproved of (' unprobehaltig,' De W.), and consequently 'rejectanei' in the matter of the faith. The active translation (' nullam probandi facultatem habentes,' Beng.) is plainly opposed to St. Paul's and the prevailing use of the word; comp. Rom. i. 28, 1 Cor. ix. 27, 2 Cor. xiii. 5, Tit. i. 16, and sce notes on ch. ii. 15, and Fritz. Rom.

Vol. I. p. 81. On this use of $\pi \in \rho!$, see notes on 1 Tim. i. 19.
9. à $\lambda \lambda$ ' о $\dot{u} \pi \rho о к о ́ \psi.] ~ ' N o t w i t h s t a n d-~$ ing they shall not mike further advance;' à $\lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha}$ with its full adversative force (ubi gravior quædam oppositio inter duo enuntiata intercedit, Klotz, Devar. Vol. 11. p. 3), here contrasting the opposition and its ultimate results, and thus introducing a ground for consolation : 'fiducia victoriæ Timoth. animat ad certamen,' Calv. There is, however, no contradictory statement to ch. ii. 16, and iii. 13 (De. W.) ; all the apostle says in fact is, that there shall be no real and ultimate

 The gloss of Bengel,-'non proficient amplius; non ita ut alios seducant; quanquam ipsi et eorum similes proficient in pejus, ver. 13,- is obviously insufficient to meet the difficulty ; comp. ch. ii. ver. $17, \nu \delta \dot{\mu \eta \nu}{ }^{\prime \prime} \xi \epsilon \epsilon$, and ch. iii. 13, $\pi \lambda a \nu \omega ิ \nu \tau \epsilon s$. The advance is not denied, but the successful advance, i.e. without detection and exposure, is denied ; ou
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 rai，Theodoret，see Est．in loc．
そע० La］＇senselessness，＇＇wicked folly，＇ ＇amentia，＇Beza ；compare Luke vi．11，
 is nearly the same，and is not＇rage of an insensate kind，＇De Wette，al．（see Thu－ cyd．III．38，where ăvola is opposed to $\epsilon \mathcal{u} \beta o u \lambda \in \dot{u} \in \sigma \hat{\sim} \alpha \downarrow$ ），but，as in the present case，＇senselessness＇in a moral as well as intellectual point of view，＇wicked，as well as insensate，folly；＇compare Beck， Bibl．Seelenl．11．18，p．51，and see 2 Macc．xiv．5，especially xv．33，and Jo－ seph．Antiq．viri．13．1，where ávola is joined with movnpia，and ascribed to Ahab．The remark of Coray is very near the truth，Tท̂s aùrท̂s $\gamma \in \nu \in a ̂ s ~ k a l ~ \tau o u ̂ ~$
 єєк $\delta \eta \lambda \circ$ s］＇openly manifest，＇$\dot{\alpha} \delta เ \sigma \tau \alpha ́ \kappa \tau \omega s$ фavepós，Coray；compare Exodus viii． 18，ix．11．The word is an ${ }_{\alpha}^{2} \pi . \lambda \in \gamma \delta \mu$ ． in the N．T．，but is found in earlier（Ho－ mer，$l l$. v．2），and is of common occur－ rence in later writers， 3 Mace．iii．19，vi． 5，Polyh．Hist．III．12．4，III．48．5，al．

10．$\pi \alpha \rho \eta \kappa о \lambda о$ и́八刀 $\eta \alpha s$ ］＇wert $a$ follower of，＇Syriac ；$\lambda_{\Delta} 0^{0} \quad \Delta \overbrace{\Delta}^{2}$［ve－ nisti post］，i．e．＇followedst as a disciple，＇ and thence，though rather too distant from the primary meaning，＇hast fully known，＇Auth．Ver．；see notes on 1 Tim． iv． 6 ，where the meaning of this word is investigated．On the force of the aor．， see critical note．In the following words， $\mu 0 v \tau \hat{n} \delta \iota \delta \alpha \sigma \kappa$ ．，the pronoun，though not necessarily always so（see Winer，Gro．ई 22．7，p．140），seems here in emphatic opposition to the subjects of the preced－ ing verse．
$\tau \hat{\eta}$ ả $\boldsymbol{\gamma}^{\omega} \gamma \hat{\eta}{ }^{\text {］}}$＇$m y$ manner of life，＇conduct．＇т $\frac{\hat{\eta}}{} \delta \iota \dot{\alpha} \tau \bar{\omega} \nu$ Еّр $\rho \omega \nu$ то入ıтєia，Theodoret，－nearly equivalent to tàs $\delta \delta o u ́ s \mu 0 v$ tàs ${ }^{\ell} \nu \mathrm{X} \rho ., 1$ Cor．iv． 17. The word is an ä́t．$\lambda \in \gamma o ́ \mu$ ．in N．＇Test．；
see，however，Esther ii．20，oủ $\mu \in \tau \neq\{\lambda \lambda a \xi \epsilon$ $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ à $\gamma \omega \gamma \dot{\eta} \nu$ aúr $\hat{s}$（＇vitæ suæ rationem，＇ Schleusn．），and compare 2 Macc．iv．16， vi． 8 ，xi．24．The meaning is rightly given by Hesych．，à $\gamma \omega \gamma^{\prime} \cdot \quad \tau \rho \delta ́ \pi o s$, àvaб－ троф́n；see also Suicer，Thesaur．s．v． Vol．I．p．72．Leo refers áy $\begin{aligned} \\ \eta\end{aligned}$ to the ＇doctrinæ ratio，＇followed by the apostle， referring to Diod．Sic．Hist．1．52， 92. but both references are false．
$r \hat{\eta} \pi \rho \circ$ 用 $\sigma \in \iota$ ］＇my purpose，＇scil．（as the following word miotis seems to hint） of remaining true to the Guspel of Christ and the great spiritual objects of his life ； ＇propositum propagandi Evangelii，et credentes semper meliores reddendi，＇ Grot．In all other passages in St．Paul＇s Epistles，$\pi \rho \delta \hat{\prime} \epsilon \sigma \iota s$ is used with reference to God ；see Rom．viii．28，ix．11，Eph． i．11，iii．11， 2 Tim．i．9．The peculiar and ceclesiastical meaning（＇altare pro－ positionis＇）is noticed in Suicer，Thes． 8. v．Vol．ri．p． 842.
$\pi\{\sigma \tau \in t$ is referred by some commenta－ tors to＇faith，＇in its usual acceptation， $\tau \hat{\eta}$ èv rois $\delta \delta \gamma^{\prime} \mu a \sigma t \nu$ ，Theoph．I，on ac－ count of the near position of aja $\pi \eta$ ；by
 бкєเข поьov́ $\eta$ ，Ecumen．，Theoph．2，so also Usteri，Lehrb．II．1．4，p．240．Per－ haps the gloss of Theodoret，סтoíav Є＇$\chi \omega$ $\pi \epsilon \rho l$ rò $\delta \in \sigma \pi o ́ \tau \eta \nu \quad \delta t a ̀ \epsilon \sigma t \nu$ ，is the most inclusive and satisfactory．
$\tau \hat{\eta} \mu \alpha \kappa \rho o \triangleq v \mu\{a]$＇my long－suffering， forbearing patience，whether towards sin－ ners generally（Theod．），or the àvtiota－ tisté $\mu \in \nu 0$（ch．ii．25）specially ：sce notes on Eph．iv．2，and on the distinction be－ tween $\mu a к \rho о s ⿱ 䒑 \mu i \alpha$ and $\pi \rho a \dot{\delta} \tau \eta s$ ，notes on 1 Tim．i．16．The definition of Zonaras （Lex．p．1330）is brief，but pithy and suggestive；$\mu \alpha \kappa \rho o \grave{v \mu i a, ~ \pi e ́ \psi ~} \begin{aligned} & \text { ss } \lambda u ́ \pi \eta s . ~\end{aligned}$ The concluding word $\dot{4} \pi о \mu о \nu \grave{\eta}$ marks fur－ ther the brave patience in enduring not only contradiction and opposition，hut even injury and wrong，and leads on



naturally to $\tau o i s ~ \delta \iota \omega \gamma \mu . \kappa . \tau . \lambda$., ver. 11. On íтоц., see notes on ch. ii. 10, and on Tit. ii. 2.
11. $\tau$ o is $\delta \iota \omega \gamma \mu$.] 'my persecutions :' 'injurias complectitur quas Judæi et ethnici Christianis propter doctrinæ Christ. professionem imposuerunt, ut verbera, delationes, vincula, relegationem,' Fritz. Rom. viii. 35, Vol. II. p. 221.
oía $\mu$ ot к. т. 入.] 'such (sufferings) as befel me'in Antioch (Acts xiii. 50), in Iconium (Acts xiv. 2 sq.), in Lystra (Acts xiv. 14, 19) ;' on the repetition of $\pi a \Delta t$ $\mu a \tau \alpha$ in translation, see Scholef. Hints, p. 124. It has been doubted why these particular sufferings have been specified. Chrysostom refers it to the fact of Timothy's acquaintance with those parts of Asia ('utpote ex Lystris oriundi,' Est.) ; this is not at all improbable, especially if we suppose these sufferings had been early known to Timothy, and had led him to unite himself to the apostle ; it is, however, perhaps equally likely that it was their severity which suggested the particular mention, compare Acts xiv.
 o\%ovs $\delta \iota \omega \gamma \mu$.] 'such persecutions as $I$ endured ;' as these (particularly at Lystra) were especially $\delta t \omega \gamma \mu o l$, not merely general $\pi a s h \mu a r a$, but sharp and active inflictions, by stoning, etc., St. Paul repeats the word, joining it emphatically with oios still more to specify the peculiar cases which he is mentioning as examples. It is certainly not necessary to regard the clause as an exclamation (Heydenr., Mack), nor is there even any occasion for supplying ' thou hast seen' what, etc. (Conyb., compare Alf.), as this seems to weaken the force of the sentence, and indeed to vitiate the construction.
$\kappa \alpha\{\varepsilon \kappa \pi d \nu \tau \omega \nu]$


 is no 'Hebraica constructio pro ex quibus omnibus,' Grot.; кal, with its usual ascensive force, gives the opposition involved in the clause which it introduces, a distinct prominence,- ' my persecutions were great, and yet God delivered me out of all ; ' compare Eurip. Herc. Fur. 508,

 s. v. II. 1. c, Vol. I. p. 1540, and further exx. in Hartung, Partik. kal, 5. 6, Vol. I. p. 148.
12. kal $\pi \alpha \nu \tau \in s \delta^{\prime}$ '] 'and all too,' or sufficiently approximately, 'yea and all,' Auth. Ver.; see especially notes on 1 Tim. iii. 10, where this construction is investigated. De Wette is here slightly incorrect on two points ; first, 'et omnes autem,' Beng., is a translation of каi- $\delta \dot{\epsilon}$ which need not be rejected, see Hand, Tursellin., Vol. x. p. 584 ; secondly, кal - $\delta \xi$ (even supposing 1 Tim . iii. 10 be not taken into account) occurs elsewhere in St. Paul's Epistles ; viz., Rom. xi. 23. The verse involves a perfectly general declaration (Calv.), and seems intended indirectly to prepare Timothy for encountering persecutions, and may be paraphrased, 'but such persecutions are not confined to me or to a few ; they will extend even to all, and consequently to thee among the number;' comp. Lücke
 'whuse will is to,' etc. ; 'computa igitur an velis,' Beng. : the verb $\underset{\text { st }}{ } \boldsymbol{\lambda}$. is not pleonastic, but points to those whose will is enlisted in the matter, and who really have some desires to lead a godly life; see Winer, Gram. \$65. 7, p. 541. The Vulg. by its departure from what seems to have been the order of the older Lat. Versions (comp. Clarom.), apparently

## 


desires to mark the connection of this participle with $\epsilon \dot{\jmath} \sigma \in \beta \hat{\omega} \mathrm{s}$ ，＇qui pie volunt vivere ；＇it seems，however，almost per－ fectly certain that the adverb belongs to ऽそे $\nu$ ，compare Titus ii．12．On the mean－ ing of $\epsilon \dot{u} \sigma \epsilon \beta \bar{\omega} s$ ，compare notes on 1 Tim． ii． 2. $\xi^{\xi} \nu \mathrm{X} \rho$ ．＇I $\left.\eta \sigma.\right]$＇in Christ Jesus，＇in fellowship，in union with Him ；＇modum exponit sine quo non contigit pie vivere，＇Est．；＇extra Chris－ tum Jesum nulla pietas，＇Beng．：comp． notes on Gal．ii．17，Eph．ii．6，7，and elsewhere．$\delta \iota \omega \chi$ ข่ท $\sigma o \nu \tau a t]$
＇shall be persecuted．＇St．Paul is here only reiterating the words of his Master，
 xv． 20 ；compare Matth．x．22， 1 Thess． iii． 3 ，etc．This declaration clearly refers to the outward persecutions which the apostles and their followers were to un－ dergo ；it may be extended，however，in a practical point of view to all Chris－ tians ；compare August．Epist．145，de Civit．xviri． 51 ，and verse 1 of that no－ ble chapter，Ecclus．ii．
 men ；＇immediate contrast with oi Nิ＇$\lambda$ ． $\epsilon \dot{v} \sigma$ ．久ॅŋע ；the subject of the verse，how－ ever，reverts to ver． 10 sq．，and，as verse 14 seems to hint，to the contrast between Timothy and the false teachers．The latter are included in the general and an－ arthrous $\pi ⿰ 丿 \nu \eta \rho o l$ ă $\nu \geqslant \rho \rho$ ．；evil men，and， consequently，they among the number． $\gamma \delta \eta \tau \in s]$＇deceivers，＇－Goth．，＇liutái＇ ［deceivers，－cogn．with Angl．－Sax．ly－ tig］；sim．though slightly less exact，Syr．，
iie $\underbrace{\circ e_{0}}_{\Delta}$［seducentes］．－The kal ap－ pends to the general $\pi 0 \nu \eta p o i$ ，apparently with somewhat of an explanatory force， a more specific and definite appellation， compare Eritz．on Mark i．5．p．11．「ó s （derived from rodo $\omega$ ）has properly refer－

 Suidas，s．v．（comp．Soph．Ajax，582， Herod．Hist．vir．191）；thence to the practice of magic arts generally，$\gamma$ óns кal фapuakeús，Plato，Symp．p． 203 D， and thence by a very natural transition to deception and imposture generally，－ apparently the prevailing meaning ；Et－ ymol．M．үóns，$\psi \in \in ́ \sigma \tau \eta s, ~ a ̀ \pi a \tau \epsilon \omega ́ \nu, ~ P o l l u x, ~$ Onom．Iv．6，үóns，à $\pi a \tau \epsilon \dot{\omega} \nu$ ，similarly Timæus，Lex．Plat．s．v．；compare De－ mosthen．de Fals．Leg．p．374，ämıбтos， róns，movnpos，Joseph．contr．Ap．II．16， oủ रờs où ${ }^{\prime}$ àmatećv．This general meaning then（opp，to Huther）seems fully substantiated．We cannot indeed definitely infer from this term that magic arts were actually used by these deceiv－ ers，but there is certainly nothing in such a supposition inconsistent either with the context，the primary meaning of the word， or the deseription of similar opponents mentioned elsewhere in the N．T．；see notes on ver．8．In the eccles．writers rojns and yovrela are frequently（perhaps commonly）used in this primary and more limited sense of the word，see Sui－ cer，Thesaur．s．v．Vol．I．p． 776.
$\pi \rho о к \delta \psi$ ои $\sigma \iota \nu \kappa . \tau . \lambda$ ．］＇will make ad－ vance toward the worse：＇＇$\pi l$ pointing to the $\chi$ eipov as the degree to which the wickedness was，as it were，advancing and ascending；compare Winer，Gr．\＆ 49，l，p．363．The $\pi \rho \circ \frac{1}{2} \pi \pi_{\eta}$ is here con－ sidered rather as intensive，in ver． 9 rather as extensive．On the apparent contradic－ tion in the two verses，sce above，notes in loc．
$\pi \lambda \alpha \nu \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \in s \kappa \alpha l$ $\pi \lambda$.$] ＇deceiving and being deceived ；＇cer－$ tainly not middle，＇letting themselves be＇ deceived＇（Beng．），but passive．It is the true $\pi \rho о к о \pi \grave{\eta}$ दं $\pi l$ гो $\chi \in i \bar{\rho} о \nu$ ；they be－ gin by deceiving others，and end in being deceived themselves．Deceit，as De W．remarks，is never without self－deceit．


14. $\pi a \rho \alpha ̀ ~ \tau[\nu o s]$ It seems best on the whole to retain rivos (Tisch. ed. 2) with C ${ }^{3}$ DEKL ; nearly all miss. ; Vulg., Goth., Copt., Syr. (both) Chrys., Theod., al. (Mill, Griesb., Scholz, Wiesing.). The reading tives adopted by Lachm. and Tisch. ed. 7 is well supported - viz., by AC1FG; 17.71 (Matthies, Huther, Alf.) ; as however the evidence of the $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$. seems to counterbalance the possible preponderance of uncial authority for the latter reading,-as the plural has somewhat the appearance of an 'explicatio' (Mill, Prolegom. p. Lxxv) by referring apparently to Lois and Eunice, ch. i. $5,-$ as the singular gives an excellent sense, and by its union with $\dot{a} \pi \grave{\partial} \beta \rho \in \in \phi$. к. т. 入. points to the two sources of Timothy's instruction, St. Paul, who taught him the Gospel, and his relatives who had previously taught him the Old Testament,- there seems sufficient reason for retaining the reading of the text.
14. $\sigma$ ̀े $\delta$ è к. т. ג.] 'But do thou abide,' etc. ; $\sigma \dot{\nu}$ in sharp contrast to the 'deceivers ' of the foregoing verse ; $\mu$ é $\nu \in$ in antithesis to $\pi \rho o ́ k о \pi \tau \epsilon$. In the following words the relarive \& taken out of $\epsilon \nu$ ois ( $=\dot{\varepsilon} y$ éreíyoıs \& ) must be supplied, not
 governing an accus. in the active (Thucyd. iv, 88), can also in the passive have an accus. appended to it according to the usual rule, Winer, Gram. § 32. 5, p. 204. Bretschneider (Lex. s. v. $\pi / \sigma \tau$.) and per-
 this can be justified, see Psalm lxxvii. 37, but involves a less satisfactory meaning of the verb. $\quad \epsilon^{2} \pi \iota \sigma \tau \omega \hat{\omega} \eta s$ ]
 not ' credita sunt tibi,' Vulg., Clarom., Goth. ('gatruaida,' a hint perhaps of the occasional Latinizing of this Version), which would require $\grave{e \pi} \pi เ \sigma \tau \in \dot{\mathcal{V}} \mathrm{\imath} \eta \mathrm{~s}$, but ' quorum firma fides tibi facta est,' Fuller, ap. Pol. Syn. ; $\mu \in \tau \grave{\alpha} \pi \lambda \eta \rho о ф о р i ́ a s ~ е ̈ \mu-~$ aधєs, Theophyl. ; compare Luke i. 4, \%va
 erly 'to make $\pi เ \sigma \tau \ell s$ ' (1 Kings i. 36, $\pi \iota \sigma \tau \omega \dot{\sigma} \alpha \iota \delta$ ©eds $\tau \delta \delta \bar{\gamma} \eta \mu \alpha$ ), thence in the pass. 'stabiliri,' 'confirmari' (2 Sam.
 pare Psalm 1xxvii. 8), and, with an accus. objecti, 'plene certiorari;' compare Suicer, Thesaur. s. v. Vol. 11. p. 744, where this meaning of the verb is well
explained and illustrated.
єiscos] 'knowing as thou dost,' compare chap. ii. 23. On tapò tivos, see critical note.
15. ка! $\delta \tau$ tк. т. $\lambda_{0}$ does not seem parallel to and co-ordinate with $\epsilon i \delta \omega \bar{\kappa} \kappa . \tau_{\bullet} \lambda_{\text {., }}$ 'sciens...et quia nosti,' Vulg., Beng., 8 \%t having the meaning 'because,' and the participial construction 'per orationem variatam' (compare Winer, Gr. § 63. II. 1, p. 509), passing into the indicative, - but is rather to be considered as simply dependent upon eióws, the particle ö $\tau \iota$ retaining its more usual meaning 'thut,' and the direct sentence presenting a second fact which Timothy was to take into consideration: סv́o airías $\lambda$ é $\gamma \in!$ тov̂


 structions are, grammatically considered, equally possible, but the latter seems most satisfactory : the former is well defended by Hofmann, Schriftb. Vol. 1. p. $572 . \quad \dot{a} \pi \delta$ हिध́фovsं] 'from a very child,' 'from infuncy;' $\epsilon \kappa$ лрю́t $\eta \mathrm{s}$ ทintkias, Chrys. The expression is perhaps used rather than $\pi \alpha \iota \delta \delta \delta^{\prime} \vartheta \in \nu$, Mark ix. 21 (Rec; Tisch. ėk $\pi \alpha \iota \delta \delta \iota \delta \hat{\vartheta}$.), to mark still more definitely the very early age at which Timothy's instruction in the Holy Scriptures commenced ; compare ch. i. 5. Bpé $\phi o s$ in two instances in the


N. T. (Luke i. 41, 44) has its primary meaning, $\epsilon^{\epsilon} \mu \beta \rho v o \nu$, Hesych. ; in all others (Luke ii. 12, 16, xviii. 15, Acts vii. 19,
 a very early and tender age. This remark is of some little importance in reference to Luke xviii. 15, where the ascensive or rather descensive force of кal is not to be overlooked.
$\tau \grave{\alpha} \quad i \in \rho \dot{\alpha} \gamma \rho \alpha \mu \mu$.] 'the sacred writings,' i. e. of the Old Test., or, possibly with more lexical exactness,- 'sacras literas,' Vulg., 'the principles of scriptural learning' (surely not letters, in the ordinary educational sense, Hervey, Serm. on Inspir. p. 11) ; compare John vii. 15, Acts xxvi. 24, and see Meyer on both passages. It is doubtful, however, whether this latter meaning is here suitable to the context, and whether $\gamma$ páu $\mu \alpha \tau \alpha$ docs not simply mean ' writings ' (see Suicer, Thesaur. 8. v. Vol. 1. p. 780), with perhups the associated idea, which seems always to have marked this usage of the word in good Greek, of being expressed in solemn or formal language; see especially Plato, Legg. Ix. p. 858 e, where it is in contrast with $\sigma v \gamma \gamma \rho \alpha \mu \mu \alpha \tau \alpha$, and ib. Gorg. p. 484 A , where comp. Stallbaum's note. Thus then the statement in Etym. Magno,
 $\mu a \tau a$, will require modification. The expression is an $\ddot{\alpha}_{\pi}^{\pi} \alpha \xi . \lambda \epsilon \gamma \delta \mu$. in N. T., but compare Joseph. Antiq. Proœm. § 3, $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ i $\epsilon \rho \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \gamma \rho \alpha \dot{\mu} \mu a \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$, and the numerous examples in Wetstein in loc. The usual terms are $\dot{\eta} \gamma p a \phi \dot{\prime}$, ai $\gamma p a \phi a$, once रpaфaí äyıa, Rom. i. 2 ; see below. $\tau \grave{\alpha} \delta v \nu \alpha \mu \in \nu \alpha]$ ' which are able,' not 'quæ poterant,' Beng. The present is used conformahly with the virtual present oijoss, to denote the permanent, enduring property of the Holy Scriptures. $\sigma \circ \phi\{\sigma \alpha t]$ 'to make wise;' compare Ps.

$\pi \rho \in \sigma \beta v \tau \epsilon ́ \rho o u s$ бoфí $\sigma \alpha 1$, and with an accus. rei, cxviii. 98. This meaning must be retained without any dilution; $\sigma o \phi l \zeta \omega$ is not merely equivalent to $\delta \iota \delta \dot{\alpha} \sigma \kappa \omega$, but marks the true wisdom which the Holy Scriptures, impart. The two prepositional clauses which follow, further specify the object contemplated in the $\sigma o \phi$ i$\sigma a l$, and the limitation under which alone that object could be attained.
єis $\sigma \omega \tau \eta p i \alpha \nu$ must be joined immediately with oo申i/बal, pointing out the direction and destination of the wisdom, the object at which it aimed; $\dot{\eta}$ 光 $\xi \omega \gamma \nu \hat{\omega}-$
 бофí $\sigma \mu a \tau a$ каl $\lambda о \gamma o \mu a x i ́ a s . . . . a ̉ \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha}$ aủvخ
 ophyl.
$\delta \iota \alpha \begin{gathered}\pi \\ \delta \\ \tau\end{gathered}, \tau \hat{\eta} S$ к. $\tau . \lambda$.$] 'per fidem, eamque in Christo$ Jesu collocatam ;' see notes on 1 Tim. iii. 13. This clause cannot be joined with $\sigma \omega$ inpia (Heydenr.), as the article in such a case could not be dispensed with before סı́d ; compare notes on Eph. i. 15, where the only cases in which such an omission can take place are recounted. The clause obviously limits the previous assertion; 'those Scriptures he [the apostle] granteth were able to make him wise unto salvation, but he addeth through the faith which is in Christ,' Hooker, Eccles. Pol. 1. 14. 4 (quoted by Bloomfield and Peile). In the same section the difference between the two Testaments is thus stated with admirable perspicuity ; 'the Old did make wise by teaching salvation through Christ that should come, the New by teaching that Christ is come.' On $\pi i \sigma \pi \iota \stackrel{\text { è } \nu}{ } \quad X_{\rho}$., see notes on 1 Tim. i. 16.
16. $\pi$ â $\sigma a \quad \gamma \rho \alpha \phi \eta$ शे $\epsilon \delta \pi \nu$.] 'Every Scripture inspired by God is also useful,' etc. ; so Origen expressly, $\pi a ̂ \sigma a \quad \gamma \rho$., సָe-
 Vol, 11. p. 443 (ed. Bened.), Syr. [both
however omit $\kappa \alpha i l$, Hammond, and the Vv. of Tynd. and Cranmer. In this important and much contested passage we must notice briefly (a) the construclion, (b) the force and meaning of the separate words. It may be first remarked that the reading is not perfectly certain, ral being omitted in some Vr. (Vulg., Copt., Syr, Arr.) and Ff.; it seems, however, highly probable that this is due rather to non-observance of the true ascensive force of the particle than to any real absence in the original MSS. With regard then to (a) construction it is very difficult to decide whether ( $\alpha$ ) సéconv. is a part of the predicate, kal being the simple copula (Auth. Ver., al.); or whether ( $\beta$ ) it is a part of the subjject, kai being uscensive, and ė $\sigma \tau \iota$ being supplied after $\dot{\omega} \phi \notin \lambda \lambda \mu$ os (as Clarom., Syr.-Thilox., al ). Lexicography and grammar contribute but little towards a decision : for on the one hand, as $\gamma \rho a \phi\rangle$ h here apparently does mean Scripture (see below), the connection by means of кal copulutivun is at first sight most simple and perspicuous (see Middleton in loc.); on the other hand, the epithet thus associated with тâs and an anarthrous subst., is in a position perfectly usual and regular (e. $g$. 2 Cor. ix. 8, Ephi. i. 3, 1 Thess. v. 22.1 Tim. v. 10, 2 Tim. ii. 21. iii. 17, iv. 18, Tit. i. 16, iii. 1, comp. iii. 2, al.), and in that appy. aluays assigned to it by St. Paul: contrast James iii. 16, 1 Pet. ii. 13 , where the change of position is appy. to mark the emphasis, see Winer, cir. § 59.2, p. 464. We are thus remanded wholly to the context : and here when we observe ( 1 ) on the negative side, the absence of everything in the preceding vv . calculated to evoke such a statement,the àeorvevoria of Seripture had not been denied even by implication, comp. Huther ; (2) that if кal be copulative, it wonld seem to associate two predica-
tions, one relating to the essential character of Scripture, the other to its practical applicabilities, which appear scarcely homogencous ; and (3), on the positive side, that the terms of verse 16 seem in studied and illustrative parallelism to those in verse 15 , रpaфŋ̀ being more specific than $\gamma \rho \alpha{ }^{\prime} \mu \mu \alpha \tau \alpha, ~ \uparrow \in \epsilon \sigma \pi \nu$, than $i \in \rho o ́ s$ (sce Tittm. Synon. 1. p. 26), and каl $\dot{\omega} \phi \in \lambda$. $\kappa . \tau . \lambda$., showing the special aspects of the more general $\tau \grave{\alpha} \delta u \nu, \sigma \in \sigma o \phi i \sigma \alpha$, , and with kal ascensive detailing, what roфí $\alpha$ at might have been thought to fail to convey, the various practical applications of Scripture. When (4) we add that Chrys.,

 pointless if the declaration in the text were explicit—Theodoret ( $\overline{\pi \epsilon} \epsilon \stackrel{\partial}{\eta} \kappa$ к. $\tau . \lambda$.,
 as far as we can infer from collocation of words, nearly all the best Vv., viz., Syr. (both), Vulg., Clarom., Goth., Copt., apparently Eth., and in effect Arm. (inserts copula after $\delta \delta \delta a \sigma \kappa$.), all adopt construction ( $\beta$ ), we have an amount of external evidence, which coupled with the internal evidence, it seems impossible to resist. We decide, therefore, not without some confidence, in favor of $(\beta)$; so Huther, Wiesinger, but not De Wette. We now notice (b) some individual expressions. $\quad \pi \hat{\alpha} \sigma \alpha \gamma \rho \alpha \phi$ b] 'every Scripture,' not 'tota Scriptura,' Beza, Auth. Ver., - a needless departure from the regular rules of grammar. Hofmann (Schriftb. Vol. I. p. 572) and others (Hervey, al.) still defend this inexact translation, adducing Eph. ii. 21; but it may be observed, that in Eph. l. c. there are strong reasons for a deviation from the correct translation which do not apply to the present case; see notes in loc. Here $\pi a ̂ \sigma \alpha \quad \gamma \rho$. implies overy individual $\gamma \rho a \phi \eta$ of those previously alluded to in the term $i \in \rho \alpha \dot{\alpha} \gamma \rho$.; $\pi \hat{a} \sigma \alpha, \pi o l a ; \pi \in \rho l \bar{\eta} s$

##  

 $\tau \eta$ श̀єóтvevotos, Chrys.; see (thus far) Middleton, Greek Art. p. 392, ed. Rose, compare also Lee, on Insp. Lect. ₹ı. p. 254 sq., and Winer, Gr. § 18. 4; p. 101. $\gamma \rho a \phi \dot{\eta}$ has by some interpreters been translated 'writing;' so apparently the tives noticed by Theopli., and perhaps

 $\mu a \tau a$. This, however, owing to the perpetual meaning of rpaф̀ in the N.T., seems very doubtful. It may be observed; indeed, that with the exception of this and four other passages (John xix. 37, Rom. i. 2, xvi. 26, 2 Pet. i. 20), $\gamma p \alpha-$ $\phi \eta$ or $\gamma p a \phi a l$ always has the article, so that its absence might warrant the translation. As, however, in John xix. 37, ypaфض clearly involves its technical meaning, 'another passage of Scripture,' and as the context requires the same in 2 Pet. l. c. (comp. Huth.), so here and in Rom. U. cc. there is no reason to depart from the current qualitative interpretation, especially as the associated epithets, and here moreover the preceding iepà $\gamma \rho \alpha \alpha_{\mu} \mu$, show that that special meaning was indisputably intended by the inspired writer.
it $\in \delta \pi \nu \in U \sigma T O S$ is a passive verbal, see Winer, Gr. § 16. 3, p. 88 ; it simply denotes 'inspired by God' comp. Phocyl. 121, సєб́тvєuбtos бoфi $\eta$, Plutarch, 1 Ior. p. 904 F, тoùs òvelpovs toùs શ̇єotveúatous; comp. Ṅєúrvoos, Jorphyr. de Antr. Nymph. p. 116), and only states what is more definitely expressed by Syriac OLO 2 [quod a Spiritu scriptum est] and still more by 2 Pet. i. 21, $\alpha \lambda \lambda^{\prime}$ ข́m $\begin{array}{r}\pi \nu \epsilon \dot{u} \mu a \tau o s \\ \hline\end{array}$
 mot. Thus, then, without overstepping the proper limits of this commentary, we may fuity say, that while this pregnant
and inclusive epithet yields no support to any artificial theories whether of a 'dynamical ' or a 'mechanical 'inspiration, it certainly seems distinctly to imply (Comp. Chrys., - in the other transIation it would formally enunciate) this vital truth, that every separate portion of the Holy Book is inspired, and forms a living portion of a living and organic whole; see (thus far) Hofmann, Schrifib. Vol. I. p. 572, Reuss, Theol. Chré. iIr. 3, Vol. I. page 297. While, on the one hand, this expression does not exclude such verbal errors, or, possibly, such trifling historical inaccuracies as man's spirit, even in its most cxalted state, may not be wholly exempt from (comp. Delitzsch, Bibl. Psychol. v. 5, p. 319), and human transmission and transcriptions may have increased, it still does certainly assure us, on the other, that these writings, as we have them, are individually pervaded by God's Spirit, and warrants our belief that they are $\tau$ às
 Clem. Rom. 1. 45 , and our assertion of the full Inspiration of the Bible; comp. Pref. to Gulatians, p. xii (ed. 2).
$\pi \rho \delta s \delta \iota \delta \alpha \sigma \kappa \alpha \lambda\{\alpha \nu$ refers, as De W. observes, to the theoretical or rather doctrinal application of the Holy Scriptures; the concluding expressions refer rather to their practical uses; see Beveringe, Serm. LX. Vol. III. p. 150 (A.-C. Libr.). Beza refers the two former 'ad dogmata,' the two latter 'ad mores,' but $\pi \rho \delta s{ }^{\text {è }} \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \gamma$. seems certainly to belong more to the latter, comp. ch. iv. 2, 1 Tim. v. 20, Tit. ii. 15.
$\pi \rho \partial s$ є̀ $\lambda \in \gamma \chi \circ \nu]$ ', for reproof, confutation,' $̇ \lambda \in$ é $\xi \xi a t ~ \tau \grave{\alpha} ~ \psi \in u-$ $\delta \hat{\eta}$, Chrysost., or better more generally, $\dot{\eta} \mu \omega \hat{\nu} \tau \partial \nu$ тapávouov Blov, Theodoret; compare Eph. v. 11. The reading $\epsilon \lambda \lambda \epsilon \gamma-$ $\mu \dot{\nu} \nu$ (Lachm. and Tischend., ed. 7 with ACFG; 4 mss .) deserves great consid-

1 solemnly charge thee to be actire and urgent, for evil teachers will abound. Discharge thy ministry ; mine is welt nigh done, and my reward is ready.



eration; it occurs several times in the LXX. e.g. Lev. xix. 17, Numbers v. 18, 2 Kings xix. 3, al. : the weight, however, of external, though not of uncial authority seems slightly in favor of the text.

1,302 [directionem, emendationem];

 word is an ${ }_{2}^{\prime \prime} \pi$. $\lambda \in \gamma \delta \mu$. in N. T., but sufticiently common elsewhere, e.g. Philo, Quod Deus Imm. § 37, Vol. 1. p. 299, ėmavópìwots tô̂ Bíov, Arrian, Epict. IIr.


 v. 88. 3, xxvif. 6. 12, al. The prep. $\epsilon \pi l$ is apparently not meroly directive but intensive, implying restoration to a previous and better state, Plato, Republ.
 voбท̂नav; see Rost u. Palm, Lex. s. v. Iv. c. 5, Vol. I. p. 1046. The distinction between ${ }^{2} \lambda \epsilon \gamma \chi$. and $\epsilon^{2} \pi \alpha \nu$. is thus not incorrectly stated by Grot., 'ė $\lambda \in \epsilon^{\gamma} \gamma \chi^{\prime} \nu \tau \alpha \iota$ inverecundi, éravopioûvтaı teneri, fragiles.'
$\pi \alpha \iota \delta \in[\alpha \nu \kappa . \tau . \lambda$.$] 'discipline which is$ in righteousness;' not exactly 'quæ veram perfectamque justitiam affert,' Just., compare Theophilact, but which has its proper sphere of action in righteousness, - in that which is conformable to the law of God. Conybeare, in translating the clause 'righteous discipline,' seems to regard ${ }^{\epsilon} \nu v$ merely equivalent to the ' Beth essentir; ' this, however, appears untenable ; compare Winer, Gr. § 29. 2. obs. p. 166 . On the proper meaning of тaıठєía (' disciplinary instruction,' a meaning which Theodoret, al., here unnecessarily obscure), see notes on Eph. vi. 4; and on $\delta u \kappa \alpha \iota \sigma o v y \eta$, see notes on 1 Tim.
vi. 11. Thus to state the uses of Holy Scripture in the briefest way ; it $\delta \iota \delta \dot{\sigma} \sigma \kappa \in \iota$ the ignorant, e' $\lambda$ ' $\gamma \chi \in t$ the evil and prejudiced, ėravopioî the fallen and erring, and $\pi a \iota \delta \in u ́ \in \iota ~ Ł ̇ \nu ~ \delta \iota \kappa$. all men, especially those that need bringing to fuller measures of perfection. For a good sermon on the sufficiency of Scripture see Beveridge, Sermon Lx. Vol. III. p. 144 sq. A.-C. Libr.).
17. ถ $\tau 0 \hat{v} ~ \Theta \in o \hat{v}$ \&̌ $\nu$ Nิp $\omega \pi 0 s$ ] 'the man of God. The very general reference of the context seems to show clearly that here at least this is certainly not an official designation, 'the servant of God,' 'the evangelist' (Beng., De Wette), bat, the Christian generally, 'qui se Deo penitus devovit,' Just. : see Philo, de Nom. Mut. § 3, Vol. x. page 582, where $\nsim ง ̊ \rho$. $\Theta$ $\Theta o v$ is used in a similar extended reference, and compare notes on 1 Tim. vi. 11. áp $\tau \iota o s]$ ' complete,' in all parts and proportions ('in quo nihil mutilum,' Calv.), an ämag $\lambda \in \gamma^{\prime} \mu$. in the N. T., explained more fully by the $\epsilon^{\xi} \xi \eta \rho-$ $\tau \iota \sigma \mu$ évos which follows. A substantially correct definition is given by Greg. Nyss. in Eccl. v. Vol. 1. p. 432, áptios $\pi \alpha ́ \nu t \omega s$
 $\pi \in \pi \lambda \eta \rho \omega \tau a \iota \lambda$ ó $\gamma$ os: thus ápтıos is opposed to $\chi \omega \lambda \delta s$ and ко入oßós,- comp. Lucian, Sucrif. §6, where he speaks of Vulcan as oưk દ̆ptios $\tau \hat{\omega} \pi \delta \delta \epsilon$, and see Suicer, Thesaur. s. v. Vol. 1. 515. It is not easy to state positively the distinction between ré $\lambda \in l o s$ and áptios, as in practice the two words seem nearly to interchange meanings ; e. g. compare Philo, de Plant. Noe, § 29, Vol. 1. p. 347, ápтıоу каı бло́кл $\quad$ рроу with James i. 4, тé $\lambda \epsilon$ tot кal $\delta \lambda$ ккл $\lambda \eta \rho o r$ : as a gencral rule גptios seems to point to perfection in regard of the adaptation of parts ('qui suam retinet compagem,'



Just.) and the special aptitude for any given uses ; $\tau \in ́ \lambda \epsilon$ tos, like'perfectus' compare Doederlein, Synon. Vol. Iv. 366), seems to imply a more general and absoIute perfection ; comp. Matth. v. 48.
$\pi \rho \delta s \pi \hat{a} \nu \quad \kappa_{0} \tau . \lambda_{\text {.] }}$ 'fully made ready for, furnished for, every good work:' ' $\xi$ gapt. ( $\pi \lambda \eta \rho \circ \hat{\imath}, \tau \in \lambda \in t o \hat{\imath}$. Hesych.) is a $\delta i s ~ \lambda \in \gamma \delta \mu$. in the N. T.; see Acts xxi. 5, where, however, it is used somewhat differently, in reference apparently to the completion of a period of time; see Meyer in loc. It occurs in its present sense, Joseph. Ant. III. 2. 2, ка入ิิs ékทртเซцย́yous, compare
 The compound катартij $\omega$ is of frequent occurrence. In accordance with the
 $\pi \hat{a} \nu$ Ĕp $\gamma$. ả $\gamma$. must obviously be referred,
 ch. iv. 5 (De Wette), but to any good works generally; so Huth., Wiesing., and Leo.

Chapter IV. 1. $\delta t a \mu a \rho \tau$ v́po $\mu a t$ ] ' I solemnly charge thee;' seo notes on 1 Tim. v. 21. The words oủv غ̇ $\gamma \dot{\omega}$, inserted after $\delta \iota \alpha \mu$. in Rec. [with $\mathrm{D}^{1} \mathrm{~K}$;-Syr.Phil., Theod. omit $\epsilon ่ \gamma \omega$, others oùv], are rightly rejected by Griesb. Tisch., Lachm., as 'injecta ob cohærentiam,' Mill, Prolegom. p. cxxix. The insertion of $\tau o \hat{u}$ Kup. before Xp. 'I $\eta \sigma$. ['I. X., Rec.], is similarly untenable.
$\tau$ ồ $\mu$ é $\lambda$ -
$\lambda 0 \nu \tau 0 s$ к. т. $\lambda$.] 'who shall hereafter judge the quicle and dend:' clearly those alive at His coming, and the dead, Chrys. 2 (comp. 1 Cor. xv. 51, 52, 1 Thess. iv. 16,17 ), not 'the spiritually alive and
 Chrys. 1, Peile. The mention of the solemn account which all must render is not without emphasis in its application to Timothy ; he had a weighty office intrusted to him, and of that His Lord $\epsilon \mathcal{J}-$
 $\tau \eta \nu \quad$ è $\pi \iota \phi d \nu \in \iota \alpha \nu]$ 'and ( 1 solemnly charge thee) by His manifestation.' The reading кãà [Rec. with D ${ }^{3}$ EKL; Goth., Syr. (both) ; Theod. al.] is here rightly rejected by Griesb., Lachm., Tisch., with АCD'FG; 17. $67^{*}$ * ; Am., Marl., al., for the less easy kal. With this latter reading the most natural construction scems to he the connection of $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \phi$. with $\delta$ tauapr. as the usual accus. in adjuration ; compare Mark v. 7, Acts xix. 13,1 Thess. v. 27. As the foregoing Ėvéntov could not be joined with ė $\pi i \phi$.,
 the accusative ; so Vulg., Clarom., 'per adventum ejus,' comp. 1 Cor. xy. 31. De Wette regards $\tau \eta \eta^{2} \dot{\epsilon} \pi เ \phi$. as the acens. objecti, e. g. Deut. iv. $26, \delta \iota a \mu$. ט́ $\mu i \nu \tau \delta \nu$ $\tau \in$ oùpavd $\kappa$ кal $\tau \hat{\jmath} \nu \nu \hat{\eta} \nu$; this seems undesirable, as it involves a change of meaning of the verb in the two clauses.
кal $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \quad \beta a \sigma$. $\alpha \cup \mathcal{v} \tau o \hat{\nu}]$ 'and by His hingdom ;' no êv $\delta \iota a ̀$ (vuoiv, 'the revelation of His kingdom ' (Syr., Beng.), nor an expression practically equivalent to $\tau \grave{\nu} \nu$ ใ̇i $\iota \phi$. aủt. (Calv.), but introductory of a sccond subject of thought,- ' and by His kingdom' (observe the rhetorical repetition of avtov̂); that kingdom (regnum glorice) which succeeding the ' modificated eternity' of His mediatorial kingdom (reynum gratice) is to commence at His द่ $\pi เ \phi d \nu$., and to know neither end nor modification ; see Pearson, Creed, Art. vi. Vol. I. p. 335 (ed. Burt.).
$2 \kappa \notin \rho v \xi \circ \nu]$ 'proclaim,' 'preach.' 'Notanda est diligenter illatio, quâ apte Scripturam (chap. iii. 16) cum prædicatione connectit,' Calvin. The solemn charge is not succeeded as in $1 \mathrm{Tim} . \mathrm{v}$. 21 by iva with the subj., nor by the inf. as in 2 Tim. ii. 14, but with unconnected yet emphatic aorists ; compare the very similar instance in 1 Thess. $\nabla$. 14. Ex-


amples of such asyndeta are, as might be expected, not uncommon in a style so furcible and sententious as that of St . Traul : see the list in Winer, Gr. § 60.1, p. 475. The aor, is here used rather than the present, as in 1 Thess. l. c., being more suitable to the vivid nature of the address; see Winer, Gir. § 60. 2, p. 476. The distinction in the N. T. between the imper., aor., and pres. can usually be satisfactorily explained, but it must not be forgotten that even in classical authors the change of tense scems often due to the 'lubitus aut affectus loquentis,' see Schœmann, Isceus, p. 235. $\epsilon^{\prime} \pi\{\sigma \tau \eta \ni \iota]$ 'be attentive,' 'be ready,'
 gentiâ] Syr. This, on the whole, scems the simplest translation of $\overline{\epsilon \pi} \iota \sigma \tau \eta ิ \nu \alpha, ~$ while it scarcely amounts quite to 'instare,' Vulg., it is certainly stronger than $\epsilon^{i} \pi i \mu \epsilon \nu \in, 1$ Tim. iv. 16, and appears to mark an attitude of prompt attention that may at any moment pass into action ; comp. Demosth. Phil. Ir. 70 (cited by De Wette), é $\gamma \rho \eta \eta^{\prime} \gamma \rho \rho \in \nu$, દ̇ $\phi \in ́ \sigma \tau \eta \kappa \in \nu$, Polyb. Hist. I. 83. 2, ė $\pi \iota \sigma \tau \grave{\alpha} s \delta_{\epsilon}-\mu \in \gamma \dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \nu$ ย̇สoteîto $\sigma \pi o u \delta \grave{\eta} \nu$. It naturally points to the preceding kńpvgov (comp. Theod.), which it slightly strengthens and expands ; 'preach the word, and be alive to the importance of the duty, ever ready to perform it, in season and out of season ;' so, in effect, Theophyl., $\mu \in \tau \grave{\alpha}$ è $\pi t-$
 the action, rather than the readiness to action, is made somewhat too prominent. De Wette and Huther (after Bretschn. Lex.) retain the semi-local use 'accede ad coetus Christianos,' a meaning lexically tenable (see examples in Schweigh. Lex. Polyb. s. v. p. 211), but involving an ellipsis which St. Paul would hardly have unade, when toîs d̀ $\delta \in \lambda \phi$ ois $\kappa . \tau . \lambda$. could
sn easily have been supplied: see Leo in loc.

є $\dot{u} \kappa \alpha[\rho \omega s \dot{\alpha} \kappa \alpha[\rho \omega s]$
'in season, out of season;' an oxymoron, made still more emphatic by the omission of the copula'; compare 'nolens volens, ultro citro,' etc., Winer, Gr. § 58. 7, p. 461. De Wette cites, as from Wetstein, Nicetas Choniat. (a Byzantine historian), єủkaípos àkaip but the citation is due to Bengel. The Greek commentators principally refer the єủkaıpía and àkcupía to Timothy ; $\mu \grave{\eta}$ кal-
 Chrysost. : Calv., Beng, and others to both Timothy and his hearers. The context seems to show that the latter (comp. verse 3 ) are principally, if not entirely, in the apostle's thoughts, and that the adverbs will be referred most naturally alone to them; compare Augustine in Psulm cxxviii., 'sonet verbum Dei volentibus opportune, nolentibus importune.' $\quad € \in \boldsymbol{\gamma} \xi \circ \rho]$ ' reprove,' ' convict them of their want of holiness and trath;' compare chap. iii. 16 , $\pi \rho \cdot{ }^{\prime} s$ єॅ $\lambda \in \gamma \chi \circ \nu$ : the stronger term, $\dot{\pi} \pi \iota \tau i \mu \eta \sigma o \nu$ (Jude 9), 'rebuke as blameworthy,' suitably follows. There is some parallelism between the verbs here and the nouns ch. iii. 16, but it is not by any means exact ;
 nor indeed таракá入. with $\pi a \iota \delta e i ́ a ~(L e o), ~$ if the usual force of the latter word be retained. The change of order in $F G$ al. ; Vulg., Clarom., Copt., Goth., al., ế $\lambda \epsilon \gamma \xi$. тарак., è eır. seems due to a desire to preserve a kind of climax.
$\epsilon^{\dot{c} \nu} \boldsymbol{\pi} \dot{\alpha} \sigma \eta \kappa . \tau . \lambda_{\text {. }}$ ' in all long-suffering and teaching,' 'in every exhibition of longsuffering and every method of teaching;' clause appended not merely to $\pi$ aракd́ $\lambda$. (Huth.), but, as in Lachm., Tisch. (so also Chrys.), to the three preceding verbs, to each one of which, especially the first (Chrys., Calv.), it prescribes suitable re-

strictions．The extensive rather than the intensive（Chrys．？）force of $\pi$ âs may be clearly seen in this combination；it gives both abstract nouns，espec．the former， a concrete application，see notes on Eph． i．8．There is thus no reason for sup－ posing an $\hat{e} v\rangle i \alpha ̀$ ，$\delta$ voîv（Grot．），or for tam－ pering with the normal meaning of $\delta i \delta \alpha-$ $\chi$ й，scil．＇teaching，＇－not＇studium do－ cendi，＇Heinr．，Flatt，＇readiness to teach，＇ Peile．It may be remarked that $\delta \iota \delta \alpha \chi \grave{\jmath}$ is only used twice in the Past．Epistles， here and in Tit．j．9，while oıoдабкалía occurs no less than fifteen times．As a very general rule，ठtōaxクे（teaching） seems to point more to the $a c t, \delta$ ，$\delta \alpha \sigma \kappa \alpha-$入ía（doctrine）more to the substance or result of teaching；compare e．g．，Thu－ cyd．Iv．126，where $\delta \delta \delta a \chi \grave{\eta}$ is joined with a verbal in－$\sigma t s$ ，$\pi$ apaké $\lambda \in v \sigma \iota s$ ．This dis－ tinction，however，cannot be pressed in the N．T．，for compare 1 Cor．xiv． 26 ， and ohserve that all the other writers in the N．T．（except James，Peter，Jude， who use neither，）use only סıōaxŋ́ ；Mat－ thew xv． 9 and Mark vii． 7 are quota－ tions．It is just possible that the more frequent use of $\delta \iota \delta \alpha \sigma \kappa \alpha \lambda i \alpha$ in these Epp． may point to their later date of composi－ tion，when Christian doctrine was assum－ ing a more distinct form ；but we must be wary in such assertions，as in St． Paul＇s other Epp．（we do not include Heb．）$\delta \iota \delta a \chi \grave{\eta}$ and $\delta \iota \delta a \sigma \kappa$ ．occur exactly an equal number of times．

3．そ̌ $\sigma$ тat $\gamma \grave{\alpha} p$ кatpós］＇For there slall be a time；${ }^{\text {＂}}$ argument drawn from the future to urge diligence in the pres－
 $\beta \in \pi \alpha ́ v t a s$ aủtoús，Clirys．It is singular that Beng，should force értai＇crit et jam est，＇as the allusion to the future is dis－ tinctly similar to that in 1 Tim．iv．1， 2 Tim．ii．16，17，iii．1．On $\dot{\text { y }}$ ， סь⿵人aбk．，see notes on 1 Tim．i． 10.
$\alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu \in ́ \xi \bigcirc \nu \tau \alpha 4]$＇will not endure，put up
with；＇＇sordet iis doctrina vera quia co－ rum cupiditatibus adversatur，＇Leo．＇A $\nu$＇́－ xouat occurs several times in St．Paul＇s Epistles，but usually with persons ；com－ pare however 2 Thess．i． 4 ，$\tau$ ais $\mathfrak{N} \lambda i \psi \in \sigma \iota$ ais à $\nu \in ́ \chi \in \sigma \hat{\epsilon} \epsilon$ ．In the following words observe the force of ioías；their selfish lusts（surely not＇inclinations，＇Conyb．） are what they especially follow in the choice of teachers．
$\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \omega \rho \in \dot{\nu} \sigma o v \sigma \iota \nu]$＇will heap up，＇ ＇will gather round them a rabble，a $\sigma v p-$

 $\lambda \omega \sigma \epsilon$ ，Chrysost．The compound form （ $่ \pi \imath=$＇hinzu ；＇addition，aggregation， Rost u．Palm，Lex．3．v．ėml，c．4）only occurs here and Cant．ii． 4 （Symm．）； the simple，ch．iii．6，and Rom．xii． 20 ； add Job xiv． 17 （Symm．）．
 itching ears，＇Auth．Ver．，＇prurientes au－ ribus，＇Vulg．sim．Clarom．，－both ex－ cellent translations ；＇metaphora desump－ ta a scabiosis quibus cutis pririt adeo ut scalpendi libidine ardeant，＇Suicer，The－ saur．s．v．：this itch for novelty，the false teachers gratified ；comp．Philo，Quod Det． Pot．§ 21，Vol．I．p． 205 （ed．Mang．），à док－
 $K \nu \dot{\eta} \vartheta \omega$（connected with $\kappa \nu \alpha ́ \omega$ ，Lobeck， Phryn．p．254）in the act．is＇to scratch，＇ in the middle，＇to scratch one＇s self＇ （Arist．Hist．An．Ix．1），in the pass．＇to be scratched or tickled，＇and thence（as appy． herc）＇prurire＇in a tropical sense，$\zeta \eta \tau \in i \nu$

 the present passage Theod．and Theoph． （not Chrys．，as De Wette asserts），and so too，it would seem，Goth．，al．，－unless
 purcly passive，paraphrasing it by $\tau \epsilon \rho$－ $\pi \delta \mu \in \nu 0 t$ ：this does not seem so forcible； the apostle does not appear to desire merely to notice the fact that they were


having their ears tickled, but to mark the uneasy feeling that always was seeking to be gratified. A word of similar meaning, $\gamma$ apy $\lambda \lambda i\} \omega$, is found occasionally in similar applications: comp. Lucian, de Calumn. 21, cited by Wetst. in loc. On the accus. àкótp, see notes on 1 Tim. vi. 5.
4. каl दे $\pi$ d к. т. . .].] 'and will turn away their ears from the truth.' The result is a complete tuirning away from every doctrine of Christian truth; ópãs

 pare notes on 1 Tim. i. 4; it must be observed, however, that as the reference is future, their nature cannot be specifically defined ; still, as throughout these Epp., the errors of the future seem represented only as exaggerations and expansions of the present, the allusion is probably substantially the same. The use of the artiele (as in Tit. i. 14) is thus also more intelligible. $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{2} \kappa \tau \rho a \pi \dot{\eta} \sigma o \nu$ $\tau \alpha_{\ell}$ ] 'will turn themselves aside;' pass., apparently with a middle force, as in 1 Tim. i. 6, v. 15; see Winer, Gr. § 39. 2, p. 233, Krüger, Sprachl. § 52. 6, p. 361 sq., and the examples in notes on 1 Tim. i. 6.
5. $\sigma \grave{v} \delta \epsilon \in$ ' But do thou:' in marked contrast to the false teachers ; compare ch. iii. 10. $\nu \hat{\eta} \phi \in \mathcal{E} \nu \pi \tilde{\alpha} \sigma \iota \nu]$ 'be sober in all things,' 'sobrius esto,' Clarom., Goth., not ' be watchful,' Syr.,
 peiv, 1 Thess. v. 6, 1 Pet. v. 8, but is by no means synonymous with it (Huth.); both here and in all other passages in the N. T., it implies 'sobriety,' literal or metaphorical ; comp. notes on 1 Tim. iii. 2. Theodoret here, and the Greek expositors on other passages, all seem to refer it to ' 'wakefulness,' apparently of an intensive


Geam. on 1 Tim. l. c., $\nu$ hфeel kal $\delta$ reqnreppact, ib. in loc., and there are a few passages in later writers (e. g. Polybius,
 which seem to favor such a meaning; still, in the present case, and in the N . T. generally, there seem no sufficient grounds for departing from the regular use and applications of the word. The derivation is doubtful, but it does not seem improbable that the iden of drinling is involved in the root. Benfoy (Wurzellex. Vol. 11. p. 74) derives it from $\nu \eta$ and $\xi^{\prime} \phi$. compared with Sanser. $a p$, 'water ; ' compare eb-rius.
$\kappa \alpha \kappa o \pi d\{\eta \sigma \circ \nu$ ] 'suffer affictions;' aor. imp. following the pres. imp., possibly with some degree of emphasis; see notes on ver. 2, and on 1 Tim. vi. 12. $\epsilon \dot{\nu} a \gamma \gamma \in \lambda \iota \sigma \tau \circ \hat{\nu}]$ 'of an evangelist:' the eivaryenıaтal did not form a special and separate class, but were, generally, preachers of the Gospel in different countries, subordinates and missionaries of the apostles; compare Euseb. Hist. Eccl.

 Thesaur. s. v. Vol. 1. p. 1234, and notes on Eph. iv. 11. This was the work to which Tim. was called when he journeyed with St. Paul (Acts xvi. 3) ; the same duties, as far as preaching the Gospel to all within the province of his ministration, still were to be performed. The sphere was only more circumscribed, but there would be many occasions on journeys, etc., ver. 9 , when Timothy could resumo the functions of an civarye入. in their fullest sense ; comp. Taylor, Episcopacy, $\$ 14$, Hofmann, Schriftb. Vol. Ir. 2, p. 250. The term ${ }^{\text {éphoy }}$ has probably an allusion to the laborious nature of the duties; see notes on ch. ii. 15 , and compare examples in Raphel, Ols. Vol. i1. p. 622. $\pi \lambda \eta \rho \circ \phi o ́ \rho \eta \sigma o \nu$

ठıакоข $\{\alpha \nu$ ] 'fully perform thy ministry;' ' ministerium tuum imple,' Vulg., Cla-
 Beza translates $\pi \lambda \eta \rho o \phi$. somewhat artifificially, 'ministerii tui plenam fidem facito,' i. e. 'veris argumentis comproba;' this is unnecessary, it is here nearly synonymous with, though perhaps a little stronger than $\pi \lambda n \dot{\rho} \omega \sigma \sigma \nu,>0{ }^{\square}$ [absolve, adimple], 'usfullei,' Goth.; comp. $\tau \grave{\nu} \nu$ ठıaкovíà $\pi \lambda \eta \rho o u ̂ \nu$, Acts xii. 25, Col. iv. 17, see Suicer, Thesuur. s. v. Vol. II. p. 753. It apparently differs only from the more simple form in being a little more intensive in meaning.
6. Ėyd $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ ] 'For $I$,' Є่ $\gamma \omega$, with emphasis in reference to the preceding $\sigma$ ú. The force of $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ is differently explained; it does not enforce the exhortation by showing Timothy he must soon rely on himself alone ('natare incipis sine cortice,' Calv.), nor urge him to imitation, compare ver. 7 (Heinr.) but, as the concluding words of ver. 5 seem to confirm, urges him to additional zeal on account of the apostle's departure ; 'tuum est pergere quo cœpi,' Leo. On the different modes of explaining the connection, see Alf. on ver. 5 sq.
乡 $\delta \eta \sigma \pi \epsilon \in \delta \quad \mu \alpha \iota$ ] 'am already being poured out (as a drink-offering);' his present sufferings form the commencement of the 'libatio'; not 'I am now ready to be offered ' (Auth. Ver.), which slightly infringes on the exact force of ऊ$\delta \partial \eta$ and $\sigma \pi \epsilon \in \delta \delta$. The particle 苊 $\delta \eta$ is not simply equivalent to $\nu \hat{v} \nu$, but in its primary use appears rather to denote what is 'near to the here' Comp. Herod. III.
 by an intelligible transition, 'what is near to the now,' calling attention to what is taking place 'on the spot' and ' at the moment,' e.g. Aristoph. Ran.
 u. Palm, Lex. s. v. 6, where this particle
is well discussed. Klotz (Devar. Vol. 11. p. 598) is thus far right in not referring $\check{0} \delta \eta$ originally to time, but his derivation from $\eta \check{\eta} \partial \eta$, 'novi,' is as hopeless as that of Hartung (Partik. Vol. x. p. 223), who refers the $\delta \eta$ to the Sanscrit dina, 'a day,' and makes the particle originally temporal; compare Donalds. Cratyl. § 201. इ̇tévסoual, 'delibor,' Vulg. (not middle 'sanguinem meum libo,' Wahl, and certainly not ' aspergor vino,' sc. ' præparor (ad mortem,' Grot.), is not synon. with avóoual [jugulor, sacrificor], Syr., but points to the drink-offering of wine which among the Jews accompanied the sacrifice (Num. xv. 5 , xxviii. 7), and was poured $\pi \epsilon \rho$ ? $\tau \delta \nu \beta \omega \mu \delta \nu$ (Joseph. Antiq. III. 9. 4, compare Ecclus. 1. 15), while among the heathen it was commonly poured upon the burning victims (Smith, Dict. Antiq. Art. 'Sacrificium'). See the very similar passage Phil. ii. 17, in which, however, there is no reason to refer the allusion to this laiter Gentile practice, as Jahn, Antiq. § 378, and apparently Suicer, Thesaurus, s. v. ; see Meyer in loc. Chrysostom urges the use of $\sigma \pi \in ́ \nu \delta$. not શ̀úo $\mu a t$, because $\tau \hat{\eta} s ~ \mu e ̀ \nu$ invalas oủ $\tau \delta$ तầ
 ठ$\lambda \lambda \frac{\nu}{}$ : the allusion seems rather to the apostle's anticipated bloody death; see Waterl. Distinct. of Sacr. § 10, Vol. $\nabla$. p. $264 . \quad \dot{\alpha} \nu a \lambda v ́ \sigma \in \omega s$ ] ' $d e-$ parture ;' not 'resolutionis,' Vulgate, i; $\left.\Delta A\right|^{n}$ ? [ut dissolvar] Syr., compare Goth. 'disvissáis, but 'discessus e vitâ,'
 $\mu o \nu$, Coray (Romaic) ; compare Phil. i.
 is no reason whatever for adopting the explanation of Elsner (Obs. Vol. ir. p. 317) who refers $\mathfrak{a} \nu d \lambda$. to 'discessus e convivio,' compare Luke xii. 36, and $\sigma \pi \epsilon \in \nu \delta \rho \mu$. to the libations of the parting
guests ：the term is perfectly general， compare Philo，Flac．$\$ 21$ ，Vol．ir．p．
 тaíav àvdi入ugiv，ib．§ 13，p．534．Jo－ seph．Antiq．xix．4．1，Clem．Rom．I． 44；see also Deyling，Obs．Vol．ir．No． 46, p． 540 ，who has commented upon the whole of this and the following verses． with his usual ponderous learning．His interpretation of $\sigma \pi \in ́ v \delta$ ．，scil．Svotá $\delta_{\rho \mu a t,}$ is，however，incorrect．Lachm．reads àva入úvećs $\mu$ ou with ACFG；al．（5）； Vulg．（ed．），Copt．，Arm．；Euseb．，Ath．， al．The authorities are of considerable weight，but perhaps scarcely sufficient to make it necessary to change the reading of Tisch．Nearly exactly the same may be said of $\tau \partial \nu \kappa \kappa а \lambda \partial \nu$ à $\gamma \omega \bar{\omega} \alpha$（Lachm．）in the next verse；see the critical notes of
 hand，＇Auth．Ver．；surely not＇hath been nigh at hand，＇Hamm．，nor＇ist vorhan－ den，＇Luther，compare Goth．＇atist＇＇［ad－ est］，but，＇stands by＇（Acts xxii．20）， ＇is all but here，＇＇steht nähe bevor，＇Hu－ ther ；comp．Acts xxviii．2，and notes on ver． 2.
7．$\tau \delta \nu \dot{\alpha} \gamma \hat{\omega} \nu \alpha \tau \delta \nu \kappa \alpha \lambda \delta \nu]$＇the good strife，scil．$\pi\{\sigma \tau \epsilon \omega s$ ；see 1 Tim ． vi．12．The repetition of the article with the epithet gives force and emphasis；
 X $\rho$ ． $\begin{aligned} & \text { if } \gamma \in \tau a t, \text { Chrys．；compare Green，}\end{aligned}$ Gramm．p．165．The metaphor itself is thus nobly expanded by Chrys．；oùठ̀ $\nu$




 does this great expositor repay perusal． $\dot{\eta} \gamma \omega \nu \operatorname{\sigma } \mu \alpha_{1}$ ］＇ 1 have striven；＇the full foree of the perfeet is here very distinctly apparent ；the struggle itself was now all out over，little more than the effects were remaining；＇$n o t a t ~ a c t i o n e m ~ p l a n e ~ p r e x-~-~$
teritam，quæ aut nunc ipsum，seu modo finita est，aut per effectus suos durat，＇ Poppo，de emend．Matth．Gr．p． 6 ：his character and claim to the crown were now fully established，see Green，Granm． p．23．The more general agonistic met－ aphor then passes into the specific one of

 ＇finivi cursum non tam vitæ quam mune－ ris，＇Leo．See especially Acts xx．24， where the apostle expresses his resolution to do，what now he is able to speak of

 ＇I $\eta \sigma o u ̂$（Tisch．）．$\quad \tau \in \tau$ そう－ คクка тウ̀ $\pi\{\sigma \tau \iota \nu]$＇ 1 have kept the faith；＇the faith entrusted to me I have kept as a sacred and inviolable deposit； compare 2 Tim．i．14．nírots is not ＇fidelity＇（Kypke，Obs．Vol．II．p．375， Raphel，Annot．Vol．11．p．623），but ＇fuith＇in its usual and proper sense； ＇res bis per metaphoram expressa nunc tertio loco exprimitur proprie，＇Beng．In this noble passage，so calculated to cheer the sorrowing heart of Timothy（Chrys．）， yea，so full of unutterable consolation to every thoughtful Christian，Chrysostom confesses to have long felt a difficulty （àтopề $\delta \iota \epsilon \epsilon \in e^{\prime} \lambda o v \nu$ ）；and even still De Wette finds in it only an opposition to the apostle＇s usual humility（ 1 Cor．iv． 3 sq ．），and but a doubtful adaptation of Phil．iii． 12 sq．It is true in both pas－ sages the same metaphor is used；but the circumstances and application are wholly different；in the one case it is the trembling anxiety of the watchful，labor－ ing minister，in the other，it is the blessed assurance vouchsafed to the toil－worn， dying servant of the Lord；see especially Waterland，Sermon xxv．Vol．v．p．679， Hammond，Pract．Catech．1．3，p． 41 （A．C．Libr．），also Neander，Planting， Vol．I．p． 346 （Bohn）．





8. $\lambda$ ot $\pi \partial \nu$ is not for rov̂ خotrov or тठ $\lambda o r \pi \delta \nu$, as any reference, whether to a period in the future, or to duration in the future (see notes on Gal. vi. 17), would not accord with the present passages; nor can it be for $\overline{\gamma \delta \eta} \eta$, which, if admissible in later writers (Schæfer, Longin. p. 400, cited by De W.), is not demonstrable in St. Paul's Epistles. The context seems to show that it is in its most literal meaning, 'quod reliquum est' (Beza), sufficiently preserved in translation by the Syriac Wior <o [a nunc], 'henceforth,' Auth. Ver. This adverbial adjective is very frequently used in Polybius; often, as here, at the beginning of sentences, e. g. Hist. Ir. 68. 9 , iv. 32.5 , x. 45.2 , but usually in the sense ' proinde igitur,' and answering to our ' further,' ' furthermore :' a more distinetly temporal use oceurs Hist. I. 12. 4, where it is carried on by $\tau \delta \delta \ell$| $\tau \epsilon \lambda \in u-$ |
| :---: |

 reserved,' 'reposita est,' Vulg., Clarom. The verb àmoкeiovar is applied both to future rewards, as here and Col. i. 5 , è $\lambda$ -
 Matth. vi. 20, xix. 21), and to future punishments (Plato, Locr. § 12, p. 104 D), and in fact to anything which is set aside, as it were a treasure, for future uses and applications ; compare Philo, Quod Det. Pot. § 34, Vol. 1. p. 216 (ed. Mang.),
 tai, compare Kypke, Obs. Vol. II. p. 320.
 $\sigma \tau$ द́ $\phi$.] 'the crown of righteousness;' resumption of the former metaphor. The genitival relation is not perfectly clear, owing to the different meanings. which Sukato oivn may receive. As this subst. appears in all cases in these Epistles to
have not a dogmatical, but a practical reference (see notes on 1 Tim. vi. 11), sc.
 most naturally be objecti, 'the crown for which (so to speak), סıкaıovivך has a
 oúvnv, Coray (Romaic), and is in fact a sort of (proleptic) gen. possessivus ; compare Krüger, Sprachl. §47.7.6 sq. Huther and Leo, with less probability, make it the genitive of apposition, comparing James i. 12, 1 Peter v. 4, Rev. ii. 10, where, however, $\left\langle\omega \grave{\eta}\right.$ and $\delta \delta^{\prime} \xi a$ are not strictly analogous with the present use of Sikatoбúvŋ.
$\dot{\alpha} \pi o \hat{o} \dot{\omega} \sigma \in i]$ 'will give,' 'reddet,' Vulg. In this compound the ả̃o does not necessarily convey any sense of due ( $\dot{\omega} \sigma a \nu \in\left\{\begin{array}{l}\tau \\ \tau\end{array}\right)$ ó $\left.\phi \in!\lambda\right\rangle \nu \nu$ кal xpéos, Theophyl.), though such a meaning can be grammatically sustained, and confirmed by occasional examples; compare Winer, de Verb. Comp. IV. p. 13. Here, and for the most part clsewhere, the preposition only seems to alluile to the reward as having been laid up, and taken as out of some reserved treasures ; 'ibi hujus verbi sedes propria est, ubi quid de aliquâ copiâ das,' Winer, p. 12 ; compare in a contrary sense, Rom. ii. 6, and see notes on Gal. iv. 5.
$\epsilon \nu \quad \epsilon \kappa \in\{\nu \eta r \hat{\eta} \hat{\eta} \mu$.] 'in that day,' scil. of final retribution. The expression $\dot{e}^{2} \kappa$ cív $\eta \dot{\eta} \eta{ }_{\eta} \mu$ '́pa is used three times in this Epistle, ch. i. 12, 18, and once in 2 Thess. i. 10 , there referring more exclusively to the coming of the Lord; see Reuss, Theol. Chret. Iv. 21, Vol. Ir. p. 243. The following words, $\delta$ ठíkatos крıтйs, stand in apposition to of Kúplos with great weight and emphasis : how this declaration of God's justice is out of harmony with St. Paul's views of grace (De W..), it is difficult to conceive. The apostle,

Come to me; all except Luke are absent on missions. Beware of Alexander. At my defence my frionds deserted me, vข̂v aiळ઼vat, кaì єторєú̃ŋ єis ఆєoбa入ovíкทv, but the Lord stood by me.
as Huther well observes, uses the סıкаia uplots $\Theta \epsilon o v ̂$ not only as a ground of warning, but even of consolation; see 2 Thess.
i. 5 .
 к. т. $\lambda$. .] 'who have loved (and do love) His appearing,' scil. His second è $\pi\llcorner\phi d \nu \in ⿺ a:$ not his first coming in the flesh (ch. i. 10), nor the first and second (Beng.), but, as the context requires, only the latter. The perfect is not here 'in the senso of a present,' Huther; it is only thus far present that it points to the persistence of the feeling ; it was a love $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \nu$
 that beginning in the past was alike present and enduring; comp. Green, Gramm. p. 319. There is thus no need for giving à $\gamma a \pi a \hat{\nu}$ the sense of 'longing for' (Beza, Wiesing.) ; it is simplyं 'diligere,' and implies a combined feeling of reverence and love, 'inest notio admirandi et colendi,' Tittm. Synon. I. p. 55 ; see also Trench, Synon. § 12. In a practical point of view, the remark of Calvin is gravely suggestive; 'e fidelium numero excludit, quibus formidabilis est Christi adventus: thus then we may truly say with Leo, 'habemus hic lapidem Lydium, quo examinemus corda nostra.'
9. $\sigma \pi \circ \frac{v}{} \delta \alpha \sigma \circ \nu$ ] 'earnestly endcavor,'

- do thy best, $\sim_{0} \Omega$ ] [curæ sit] Syriac ; compare ver. 21, Tit. iii. 12. There is scarcely a pleonasm in the expression $\sigma \pi o v ́ \delta a \sigma o \nu-\tau \alpha \chi \epsilon$ ' $\omega$ (Winer, ( ${ }^{\gamma} r . \S 65.1$, p. 531 ), as $\sigma \pi 0 v \delta \dot{\alpha} \zeta \epsilon(\nu)$ involves more the idea of earnest and diligent endeavor than that of mere haste ( $\sigma \pi \epsilon u \delta^{\prime} \epsilon / \nu$ ). though the latter meaning is also sometimes found, e. g. Axistoph. Thesm. 572, ̇̇бтоvסакvía
 rule, ' $\sigma \pi \epsilon \dot{v} \delta \epsilon \iota \nu$ est festinare (de tempore),
$\sigma \pi o v \delta d \zeta \epsilon \iota$ properare, i. e. festinanter et sedulo aliquid facere,' Tittm. Synon. I. p. 190. According to Pott, Etym. Forsch. Vol. 1. p. 239, the fundamental idea of both verbs is 'premere,' 'pressare.' On the strengthened vowel (guna), see Donalds. Crutyl. § $223 . \quad \tau \alpha \chi \in ́ \omega$ s] More fully explained in ver. $21, \pi \rho \delta \chi \chi \epsilon \mu \hat{\omega} \nu o s$. It is singular that so intelligent a commentator as De W. should represent this invitation as the main object of the letter (Einleit. § 3); surely the solemn and prophetic warnings of the previous chapters cannot be merely 'obiter dicta.'

10. $\Delta \eta \mu \hat{a} s]$ Mentioned with St. Luke (Col. iv. 14) as sending salutations to the Colossians, and with the same evangelist and others, as a $\sigma v \nu \epsilon p$ ós (Philemon 24). Mournful and unmanly as the conduct of Demas is here described to be, there scems no just reason for ascribing to him utter apostasy (Epiph. Hcer. 41. 6) ; he left the apostle in his trials and sufferings ('̇ $\gamma \kappa a \tau e ́ \lambda ı \pi \epsilon \nu$ ) because he loved safety and ease and the fleeting pleasures of this world ( $\tau \dot{\partial} \nu \nu \hat{v} \nu$ aīv$\overline{\text { a }}$ ), and had not the Christian fortitude to share the dangers, or the Christian love to minister to the sufferings, of the nearly desolate apostle; $\tau \hat{\eta} s$ à $\nu \epsilon ́ \sigma \epsilon \omega s$ épaovés, $\tau 0 \hat{u}$


 yous, Chrysostom; see Moshcim, de Reb. Christ. § 60, p. 174, and compare Taylor, Duct. Dub 1. 2. 5. 19, who, however, makes the singular mistake of asserting (from Col. and Philem.) that Demas returned to his duty. The name is prob)ably a shortened form of 1)emetrius; compare Winer, $R W B$. s. v. Vol. r. p. $264 . \quad$ E่ $\gamma \kappa \alpha \tau \in ่ \lambda \iota \pi \in \nu]$ 'forsook,' 'dereliquit,' Vulg., Clarom. The

##  

11. ă $\gamma \epsilon$ ] So CDEFGKL; Chrys., al. ...(Griesb., Scholz, Lachm. (ed. maj.), Huther, and apparently Wiesing.). The aor. ă $\gamma \alpha \boldsymbol{}$ is adopted by Tisch. (ed. 1, 2, 7) on the authority of $\mathbf{A}$; 31.38.71. al. ; Theodoret, Dam....(Lachm. (ed. stereot.), Alf.). It would seem, however, that this is insufficient authority for the change, and that Lachm. was right in the alteration adopted in his larger edition.
compound form seems here to imply leaving behind in his troubles and dangers ; compare ver. 16, 2 Cor. iv. 9, and especially Plato. Symp.p. 179 A, Є̇ $\gamma к \alpha т а-$
 meaning, however, must not always be pressed, as there are several instances, especially in later Greek, in which é $\gamma \kappa \alpha-$ $\tau \alpha \lambda$. seems scarcely different from $\kappa \alpha$ тa入. ; see Ellendt on Arrian, Alex. 1. 20. 6, p. 100. The reading éyкатd $\lambda \in t \pi \in \nu$ is adopted by Tisch. (ed. 7) with strong uncial authority. The itacism ( $\epsilon \iota$ for $\iota$, etc.), however, that is found even in the very best MSS., renders it doubtful whether the same tense is not intended, whichever reading be adopted.
$\dot{a} \gamma \alpha \pi \dot{\eta} \sigma a s$ ] 'having loved,'sc. 'because he loved:' apparently rather a causal (comp. Donalds. Gr. §616) than a temporal (Alford, al.) use of the participle; his love of the world was the cause of his leaving. There is an apparent contrast between this clause and $\dot{\eta} \gamma а \pi \eta \kappa \kappa ́ \sigma t \nu$ $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ eं $\pi \iota \emptyset .$, ver. 8 ; 'luctuosum antitheton,' Beng. $\tau \delta \nu \nu \hat{\nu} \nu$ $\alpha i \hat{\omega} \nu \alpha]$ 'the present world,' ' the present (evil) course of things.' On the meaning of ai $\omega$, see notes on Eph. ii. 2. Beside the regular temporal meaning [ Syr .
$3 \mathrm{SO}_{4}^{0}$ ] which is always more or less apparent in the word, an ethical meaning (as here) may often be traced; see Reuss, Theol. Chret. Iv. 20, Vol. II. p. 228.
$\Theta \in \sigma \sigma \alpha \lambda o \nu\{\kappa \eta \nu$ \} Perhaps his home; eti, єто ôкоє т тифâv, Chrysost. For an account of this wealthy city, see notes on 1 Thess. i. 1.

K $\rho \boldsymbol{\eta} \sigma \kappa \eta \mathrm{s}$ ]

Of Crescens nothing is known ; the accounts of his having been a preacher in Galatia (Const. Apost. vir. 46, Vol. r. p. 385, ed. Cot.), or in Gaul (Epiph.), and having founded the church of Vienne are mere legendary glosses on this passage. The reading $\Gamma a \lambda \lambda\{\alpha \nu$ [C; al. (5); Amit.*, Æth.-Rom.; Euseb., Theod.Mops., Epiphan., Hier.] is probably due to these current traditions.
$\Delta \alpha \lambda \mu \alpha \tau\{\alpha \nu]$ A part of Illyria on the eastern coast of the Adriatic, lying southeast of Liburnia, and mainly bounded by the Bebii Montes on the north and the river Drinus to the east : the principal cities were Salona (on the coast), and Narona inland; comp. Plin. Hist, Nat. rir. 26, Cellarius, Notit. Lib. ir. 8, Vol. 1. p. 614, and Forbiger, Alt. Geogr. § 121, Vol. 1ir. p. 838.
11. $\Lambda$ ouk $\hat{\alpha} s$ ] Comp. Col. iv. 14, Philem. 24 ; the evangelist accompanied St. Paul on his second missionary journey, Acts xvi. 10 ; again goes with him to Asia (Acts xx. 6), and Jerusalem (Acts xxi. 15), and is with him during his captivity at Cæsarea (Acts xxiv. 23), and his first captivity at Rome (Acts xxviii. 16). Of the later history of St. Lake nothing certain is known ; according to Epiphanius (Heer. Lr. 11), he is said to have preached principally in Gaul ; see Winer, RWB. s. v. Vol. II. p. 35, and compare the modern continuation of the Acta Sanct. (Octr. 18), Vol. virı. p. 295 sq. The name is probably a contraction of $\Lambda o u k a \nu b s$, and is said to indicate that he was either a slave or a 'libertus ;' sec Lebeck's article on substantives in -âs,

##  <br> 

in Wolf, Analecta Lit. Vol. II. p. 47 sq. M \& $\rho \kappa$ o $\left.{ }^{2}\right]$ The evangelist St. Mark was converted apparently by St. Peter (1 Pet. v. 13) ; he, however, accompanied St. Paul and his $\alpha \nu \in \psi \iota \partial s$ St. Barnabas on their first missionary journey (Acts xii. 25 ), but departed from them (Acts xv. 38) and was the cause of the dissension between the apostle and St. Barnabas (ver. 39). He was again with St. Paul (Col. iv. 10), and, lastly, is here invited to return to him, having been a short time previously (if we adopt as the probable date of 1 Pet. A. D. 65-67) with St. Peter (1 Pet. v. 13). Of his after history nothing certain is known ; the most current tradition assigns his latest labors to Egypt and Alexandria, Epiph. Hcer.lı. ; comp. Acta Sanct. (April 25) Vol. In. p. 351. $\dot{\alpha} \nu a \lambda \alpha \beta \omega \nu$ ] 'having taken (to thee) ; ${ }^{2}$ in the present use of this compound the primary local force of à $\nu$ dे (more clearly seen Eph. vi. 13, 16) is somewhat obscured (comp. àvaঠııóval), though still not to be wholly passed over; Timothy was to take to himself as a companion the evangelist; see Winer, de Verb. Comp. Fasc. III. p. 1, who very clearly defines the two uses of this preposition in composition, (a) the usual physical sense ; (b) the derivative sense, involving the ideas of return or repetition. $\epsilon \check{\check{y}} \chi \rho \eta \sigma \tau \circ \mathrm{~s}]$ 'serviceable,' ch. ii. 21 ; possibly as Grot. suggests, on account of his knowledge of Latin ; though, more probably in reference to assistance in preaching the Gospel ; $\epsilon$ is т $\grave{\eta} \nu$ סıaкoviav

 The translation of the Auth. Vers. 'for the ministry' (objected to by Conyb.), may thus be defended; the omission of the article (after the prep.) of course causing no difficulty; see Winer, (ír. § 19. 2. b, p. 114. On the whole, however, it is perhaps more exact to retain a neu-
tral translation 'for ministering,' which, while it does not exclude other services, may still leave the idea of the $\epsilon \dot{\jmath} \alpha \gamma \gamma \in \lambda$ เкทो ठเакоvía fairly prominent.
12. Tv́Xtкov $\delta$ é] 'but Tychicus;' the $\delta \hat{\epsilon}$ appears to refer to a suppressell thought; not, however, to one suggested by the 1st member of ver. 11 (Wieseler, Chronol. p. 428), but, as the more immediate context seems to require, by the
 'bring Mark, I need one who is $\epsilon$ 厄̌ $\chi \rho$.; I had one in Tychicus (Eph. vi. 21), but he is gone.' Un the accent see Winer, Gr. § 6, p. 49 .

The chronology is here not without difficulty. Tychicus, who was with the apostle on his third missionary journey, and went before him to Troas (Acts xx. 5), is mentioned (Eph. vi. 21, Col. iv. 7) as sent by St. Paul into Asia to comfort the hearts of his converts. Now, as the Epistle to the Eph. and Coloss. cannot with any show of reason be assumed as contemporaneous with the present Epistle, we must assume that this was a second mission to Eiphesus, the object of which however is unknown. The first mission took place at the apostle's first captivity at Rome ; this, it would seem, takes place at a second and final captivity. We thus take for granted that the apostle was twice in prison at Rome. Without entering into a discussion which would overstep the limits of this commentary, it may be enough to remark that though denied by Wieseler (Clironol. p. 472 sq .), and but doubtfully noticed by Winer, $R W B$. Vol. 11. p. 220 (ed. 3), the ancient opinion of a second imprisonment (Euseb. Hist. 11. 22) is in such perfect harmony with the notices in these Epistles, and has, to say the least, such very plausible external arguments in its favor, that it does seem to remain far the most satisfactory of all the hypotheses that have as

yet been advanced ; see especially Neander, Planting, ch. x. Vol. x, p. 331. sq. (Bohn), Wiesinger, Einlert. § 3, p. 576. $\epsilon$ is ${ }^{\nu} E \phi \in \sigma \circ \nu$ ] These words have been urged by Theodoret and De Wette as affording a hint that Timothy was not then at Ephesus ; compare Tit. iii. 12, $\pi \rho \partial s \sigma \epsilon$. This is perhaps doubtful ; compare Wieseler, Chronol. p. 462. This latter writer taking à $\pi \epsilon ́ \sigma \tau \epsilon!\lambda \alpha$ as an epistolary aor, conceives that Tychicus was the bearer of this letter (see Chronol. p. 428), this, again, is very doubtful, and in many respects a very unsatisfactory hypothesis. Does, however, the language wholly forbid the conjecture that Tychicus was the bearer of the first epistle? It has been frequently remarked in these notes that the first epistle seems to have been written at no great distance of time from the second.
13. $\phi \in \lambda \delta \nu \eta \nu$ ] 'cloak,' Auth. Ver., 'penulam,' Vulg., 'hakul,' Goth., - a long, thick, and apparently sleeveless cloak, with only an opening for the head,


 еккєเто, Chryв. There seems no reason to depart from the former and usual sense; the second interpretation noticed by Chrysostom, 'case for writings,'
 p. 423), was probably only an interpr. suggested by the connection, and by the thought that the apostle would not have been likely to mention an article so comparatively unimportant as a cloak, especially when near his death. One reason, at any rate, seems suggested by ver. 21, $\pi \rho \delta \chi \in \neq \mu \omega \bar{\nu} o s$. The word is found in several other passages, e $g$. Poll. Onomast. vir. 65, Athen. Deipn. nil. p. 97, Arrian, Epict. Iv. 8 ; see also Suicer, Thesaur. s. v. Vol. 11. p. 1422, who, how-
ever, with but little probability seems to advocate two forms, фatvó $\eta \eta$ s and $\phi \in \lambda \delta^{-}$ $\nu \eta s$ (comp. Hesych.) deriving apparently the former from $\phi$ alyo and the second from $\phi \in \lambda \lambda 6$ s, 'pellis.' There is indeed an almost hopeless confusion among the Greek lexicographers on this word or words, some making фai入 $\omega \nu \eta s$ (Suid.), aliter $\phi \in \lambda \boldsymbol{\lambda}^{\prime} \nu \eta s\left(E t y m\right.$. $1 I$.), to be the $\gamma \lambda \omega \sigma^{-}$ $\sigma$ óконоv, and фaıvó入ทs (Suid.), or yet again, $\phi \in \nu \dot{\sigma} \lambda \eta s$ (Suid.), to be the cloak. On the whole, it seems probable that the true form is $\phi a \nu \nu \delta \lambda \eta s$, and that it is derived from the Latin, 'pænula' (Rost u. Palm, Lex. s. v.), not vice versà, as in Voss, Etymol. s. v. Here Tisch. rightly adopts the orthography best supported by MS. authority. For further information, see the dissertation ' de Pallio Pauli' in Crit. Sacr. Thess. Vol. II. p. 707, the special treatise on the 'pænula' by Bartholinus in Grævius, Antiq. Rom. Vol. vi. p. 1167 sq , and the numerous archæological notices and references in Wolf, Cur. Phil. in loc.




 probably, perhaps, books generally, Bull, Serm. xv. p. 180 (Oxf. 1844). It is, however, useless to guess at either the contents of the $\beta_{1} \beta \lambda i \alpha$, or the reasons for the request.
$\mu \alpha{ }^{\prime} \lambda \leqslant \sigma \tau \alpha$ $\tau$ dे $s \mu \in \mu \beta \rho$.] 'especially the parchiments;' the former were probably written on papyrus, the latter on parchment, ' membrana' (membrum, membrana cutis) ; compare Hug, Einl. Vol. x. §11. See also Suicer, Thesuur. s. v., aud Smith, Dict. Antig. s. v. It is not wholly improbable, as the $\mu \dot{d} \lambda \iota \sigma \tau \alpha$ seems to indicate, that the parchments were writings, whether 'adversaria' or otherwise, of the apostle himself; compare Bull, Serm. xv. p. 183

 Kúpios кatà тà є́pүa aủvov̂．${ }^{13}$ ôv кai $\sigma u ̀ ~ \phi u \lambda a ́ \sigma \sigma o v, ~ \lambda i a \nu ~ \gamma a ̀ p ~$
sq．，－a sermon well worthy of perusal． Of Carpus nothing is known，nor of the journey to Troas ；it certainly could not have been that mentioned Acts xx．6，a visit more than six years anterior．

14．＇A $\lambda \in \xi \in \nu \delta \rho o s]$ See notes on 1 Tim．i． 20 ：whether this evil man was then at Ephesus or not cannot be deter－ mined；the former supposition is per－ haps most probable ；see Wieseler，Chro－
 ＇showed me much ill treatment；＇＇multa mihi mala ostendit，＇Claroman．，Vulg． ［mala mihi］；єัง $\lambda \iota \psi \epsilon \in \mu \in \delta \iota \alpha \phi \delta \rho \omega s$ ，Chrys． The translation＇hath（？）shown much ill feeling＇（Peile），is unnecessarily restrict－ ed，and that of Conyb．，＇charged me with much evil＇（forensic use of the active）， in a high degree improbable．The＇in－ tensive＇middle（see Krüger，Sprachl．§ 52．8．5，and notes on Eph．ii．7）év $\delta \in\{\xi-$ aonat，with a dative personce and acc．rei， is frequently used both in a good（e．g． ［Demosthen．］Halonn．p．87）and a bad sense（Gen．1．15，17），and seems clearly to point to the exhibition of outward acts of injury and wrong to the apostle．
$\dot{\alpha} \pi o \delta \omega \dagger \eta$ ］＇may the Lord reward him according to his works ；＇$\pi \rho o ́ \rho \rho \dot{\rho} \eta \sigma^{\prime} \dot{s}^{\text {é } \sigma \tau เ \nu, ~}$ oùk ápá，Theodoret．Even this limita tion is not necessary：St．Paul might properly wish that one who harl so with－ stood the cause of the Gospel（ $\eta \mu \in \tau \in$＇́pous $\lambda$ joats，see below，ver． 15 ），and who had as yet shown no symptom of repent－ ance（ $\hat{\nu}$ каi б⿱亠乂 к．т．入．），might be reward－ ed according to his works．On the late and incorrect form àmo $\delta \psi \neq \eta$ for $\alpha \pi o \delta o i \eta$ ， compare Lobeck，Phryn．p．345，Sturz， de Diul．Maced．p．52．The reading is
 is supported by very strong external au－ thority，ACD ${ }^{1} \mathrm{E}^{1} \mathrm{FG}$ ； 15 mss ；Boern．， Vulg．，al．（Griesb．，Scholz，Lachm．，Alf．）；
still as dogmaticel reasons might so very naturally suggest the change of the opt． into the fut．，while no plausible reason can be alleged for the converse，－as again，there are no paradiplomatic argu－ ments［such as arise from erroneous transcription］in favor of the change to the fut．，while there are some for the change to the opt．（the reading，$-\delta \omega \sigma \epsilon t$ may have been a correction of $-\delta \omega \epsilon \iota$ ，com－ pare Mill，Prolegomena，p．49），we seem justified in retaining à $\pi 0 \delta \varphi^{\prime} \eta$ ，with $\mathrm{D}^{3} \mathrm{E}^{3}$ KL ；great majority of mss．；Clarom．， Sangerm．，Amit．，al．Tischendorf（ed． 2）has thus apparently with judgment reversed the reading of his first ed．：so De．W．and Wiesing．

15．$\delta \nu \kappa$ ка！$\sigma$ ̀̀ к．т．$\lambda$.$] ＇Of whom do$ thou also beware．＇This advice seems to confirm the supposition that Alexander was then at Ephesus（see ver．14），unless indeed we also adopt the not very proba－ ble opinion of Theod．，noticed in notes on ver．12，that Timothy was not now at Ephesus．
$\lambda$［а $\left.\nu \gamma \grave{\alpha} \rho \kappa . \tau . \lambda_{0}\right]$ ＇for he greatly withstandeth our words；＇ reason why Timothy should beware of Alexander．If the $\dot{\eta} \mu$ ह́ $\tau \in \rho o \iota \lambda$ र́roı allude to the defence which St．Paul made，and which Alexander opposed（sec Wieseler， Chronol．p．464），Alexander must be conceived（if originally from Ephesus） to have gone to Rome and returned again． It must be observed，however，that the studied connection of this clause with $\delta \nu$
 $\kappa$ ．$\tau . \lambda$ ．，secms rather to militate against this supposition，and to suggest a more
 $\lambda o ́ \gamma o l s$, The reading à áté $\sigma \tau \eta$（Lachm．， A（f．，al．）is fairly supported［ACD ${ }^{\prime}$（FG
 evidence apparently inferior to that in the text（Rec．，Tisch．，al．）



16. $\epsilon \nu \tau \hat{\eta} \pi \rho \dot{\omega} \tau \eta$ к. т. $\lambda_{\text {.] }}$ ' at my first defence;' compare Phil. i. 7, but observe that there $\tau \hat{\eta}$ àmo ${ }_{\text {. , }}$, on account of the article, must be connected with $\tau 0 \hat{v} \epsilon \dot{\jmath} \alpha \gamma \gamma \in \lambda\{o v$, and that the circumstances alluded to are in all probability wholly different. Timothy was then apparently with him (Phil. i. 1) ; now he is informing him of something new, and which happened at his last imprisonment, see Neander, Planting, Vol. I. p. 334 (Bohn). This àmoд. три́тŋ was in all probability the 'actio prima,' after which, as a 'non liquet' (see Smith, Dict. Antiq. s. v. 'Judex') had been returned, an 'ampliatio' (comp. à $\nu \in \beta \dot{d} \lambda \in \tau 0$, Acts xxiv. 22) had succeeded, during which the apostle is now writing; see especially Wieseler, Chronol. p. 409 sq., and compare Rein. Rom. Privatrecht, v. 2. 6, p. 450. Conyb. and Howson (St. Paul, Vol. 1x. p. 580, ed. 2) deny the continuance under the emperors of this custom of 'ampliatio' on the authority of Geib, Röm. Crim.-Proc. p. 377 : this, however, does not appear fully made out. $\quad \sigma \nu \mu \pi \alpha \rho \in \gamma \in \bar{\epsilon} \in \tau 0]$ 'stood forward with me,' 'adfuit,' Vulg., scil. as a 'patronus' to plead in my defence, or more probably as an 'advocatus' to support by his counsel ; compare [Demosth.] Necer. p. 1369, бvитараяє-
 gards the practice of Christians supporting and comforting their brethren in prison, Lucian, de Morte Peregr. § 13. Examples of the similarly forensic ex-
 are cited by Elsner, Obs. Vol. y. p. 319. On the respective offices and duties of 'advocatus' and 'patronus,' see Rein, Röm. Privatrecht, v. 1. 3, p. 425.
 chis compound, see notes on verse 10 .

The reason of the desertion was obvious-
 ímox $\omega$ p $\eta \sigma t s$, Theod. The knowledge of this suggests the clause, $\mu \grave{\eta}$ av̉roîs $\lambda o \gamma!\sigma$ Nein, in which the apostle's pardon is blended with his charitable prayer; ' may God forgive them, even as I do.' The reading of $A C D^{2} D^{3} E F G L$ appears sim. ply due to itacism; so again, àmé $\bar{\epsilon}$ ! $\pi \pi \nu$, with CL, al., in ver. 20 : see Tisch. Prolegom. p. xxxvii (ed. 7).
17. $\delta \delta$ è Kúpıos] In marked contrast to ver. 16 ; 'man, even my friends, deserted me, -but my Lord stood by me.'. $\left.\quad \xi^{2} \nu \in \delta \nu \nu d \mu \omega \sigma \in \nu\right]$ 'gave me inward strength,' i. e. $\pi a \beta p \eta \sigma l a \nu$
 ostom; see notes on 1 Tim. i. 12. The purpose of the $\grave{\varepsilon} \nu \delta \nu \nu \dot{\alpha} \mu \omega \sigma$ ts then follows. As ever, the apostle loses all thought and feeling of self, and sees only in the gracious aid ministered to him a higher and a greater purpose : so Chrys., and after him Theophyl. and Ecum.
$\pi \lambda \eta \rho \circ \phi \circ \rho \eta \hat{n} \hat{\eta}]$ 'might be fully performed, fulfilled,' ' adimpleatur,' Clarom., Syriac, - not 'might be fully known,' Auth. Ver., 'certioraretur,' Beza. 'There seems no reason to depart here from the meaning assigned to $\pi \lambda \eta \rho \circ \phi$. in verse 5 (see notes) ; the кп́puyua (observe not єìaryéniov) was indeed fully performed, when in the capital of the world, at the highest earthly tribunal, possibly in the Roman forum (Dio Cass. lvir. 7, lx. 4, - after Claudius however, doubtful), and certainly before a Roman multitude, Paul the prisoner of the Lord spake for himself, and for the Gospel ; see Wiesel.," Chronol. p. 476, who has illustrated and defended this application with much ability.

кal $\dot{\alpha} \kappa o u ́ \sigma \omega \sigma \iota \nu$ к. т. $\lambda$.$] ' and all the Gentiles might hear :'$ further amplification of the preceding


words ; not in reference to any preachings after his first captivity (comp. Theodoret, De W.), but simply in connection with his public ároлoyia in this his second captivity. The position of $\mathbb{I v a}$, after
 in $\eta \nu$, seems certainly to confirm this: see Wieseler, Chronol. p. 476. The reading of Rec. àкov́ $\sigma \eta$ (with KL ; al. ; Chrys., Theod.), is only a grammatical correction. $\kappa \alpha) \epsilon \dot{\rho} \dot{\rho}$ 'and I was rescued;' second and further act of the Lord towards his servant; He inspired him with strength, and further, rescued him. The aor. is purely passive; several of these 'deponentia media,' e.g.
 besides an aor. med., an aor. in the pass.
 к. $\tau . \lambda$.$) is completely passive in sense;$ compare $\epsilon^{\prime} \uparrow \in \operatorname{div}^{2} \eta \nu$, Matth. vi. 1, Mark
 1 Cor. ii. 12 , Phil. i. 29 , and see further examples in Winer, Gr. § 38. 7. p. 231.
 ently explained. The least probable interpretation seems a reference to the lions of the amphitheatre (Mosheim, and even Neand. Plant. Vol. I. p. 345 , note), the most probable, perhaps, that of the later expositors (De Wette, Huth., al.), that it is a figurative expression for the greatest danger, 'generaliter periculum,' Calv., compare 1 Cor. xv. 32, éN ทpıo $\mu \alpha \alpha^{-}$ $\chi \eta \sigma \alpha$ (see Meyer in loc.). Ignat. Rom. 5,
 the somewhat parallel allusions are similarly figurative. The most current interpretation is that of the Greek commen-- tators, who refer the expression to Nero :
 むิठes. Chrysostom, al. ; hut it is doubtful whether he was then at Rome ; see Pearson, Ann. Paul. Vol. 1. p. 395 (ed. Churton), who consequently transfers it to

Helius Cæsareanus. Wieseler finds in $\lambda \epsilon ́ \omega \nu$ the principal accuser (Chronol. p. 476); alii alia. Leo, with very good scnse, retracts in his preface, p. xxxviii, his reference of $\lambda \lambda^{\prime} \omega \nu$ to Nero, observing the omission of the article (which might have been expected, as in Joseph. Antiq. XVIII. 6. 10, тés omission cannot indeed be pressed, as it might be due to correlation (Middleton, Art. III. 3. 7) ; it may be said, however, that it is highly probable that if Nero, or a definite person (human or spiritual, e.g. Satan, compare Alford in loc.), had been here meant, it would have been inserted, as in the examples in Winer, Gr. § 18. 2. b, p. 114 sq . The most pertinent remark is that of Hnth., that it is to the $\sigma \tau \delta \mu a$ 入є́ovтos (Löwenrachen), not to the $\lambda \hat{\epsilon}^{\prime} \omega \nu$, that the attention is principally directed.
18. $\left.\delta \dot{v} \sigma \in \tau a_{t} \kappa . \tau . \lambda.\right]$ 'The Lord shall rescue me from every evil work;' continuation of the foregoing declaration, in a somewhat changed application : $\kappa \alpha l$, which would make the connection more close, is rightly omitted by Lachm. and Tisch., with ACD ${ }^{1}$; 31, al.; Clarom., Sangerm., Aug., Vulg., Copt., Arm., al. The change of prep. (curiously enough not noticed by apparently any commentator) points more generally to the removal from (see Winer, Gr. § 47, p. 331 compared with p. 327) all the evil efforts that were directed against the apostle and the evil influences around him, - not merely all that threatened him personally, but all that, in his person, thwarted the Gospel. Thus mounpos retains its proper sense of 'active wickedness " ( $\pi$ apà
 Trench, Synon. § 11), and ěprov its more usual sense. Most modern commentators (except Wiesing.), following Chrys., al., either explain $\pi \alpha \nu \tau \partial s$ ép $\gamma . \pi o \nu$. as $\pi \alpha \nu$ -

 $\boldsymbol{a} \dot{\omega} \omega \dot{\nu} \omega \nu, \dot{a} \mu \dot{\eta} \nu \cdot$
Salutations and personal notices.
 'Oעпбиф'́рои оіккор.
$\tau \delta s$ ápapt $\dot{\mu} \alpha \tau \sigma s$, in reference to St. Paul, - a change from the objective in ver. 17 to the subjective which is not very satisfactory, - or take ${ }_{\epsilon} \mathrm{F}$ pò as equivalent to $\pi \rho \hat{a} \gamma \mu \alpha, \chi \rho \hat{\jmath} \mu \alpha$, a meaning which though defensible (see examples in Rost u. Palm, Lex. s. v.), is not necessary. There is no declaration that the apostle shall be rescued out of his dangers, which would be inconsistent with ver. 6 ; it is only said in effect in ver. 7,8 , that he shall be removed from the sphere of evil in every form: 'decollabitur? liberabitur, liberante Domino,' Beng. The transition to the next clausc, from the $\dot{\alpha} \pi \delta$ to the eis, is thus very easy and natural.
$\sigma \omega \sigma \in t \in i s]$ 'shall save me into:' a prægnans constructio, 'shall save and place me in,' compare chap. ii. 26, and see further examples in Winer, Gr. § 66. 2, p. 547. There is thus no reason for modifying $\sigma \omega \omega_{\epsilon \epsilon L \nu}$ (scil. « $\xi \in \epsilon \mu \epsilon$ єis к. $\tau$. $\lambda$., Coray; compare Eurip. Iph. T' 1069), still less for referring it merely to preservation from earthly troubles (Reuss, Thiéol. Chrét. Iv. 22, Vol. 11. p. 251) followed as it is by the explicit т $\boldsymbol{\jmath} \nu \beta \alpha-$ $\sigma_{\iota} \lambda \in i ́ a \nu \quad \tau i ̀ \nu \quad$ ėmoupáviov. In these last words it has been urged by De Wette and others that we have a thought foreign to St. Paul. Surely this is an ill-considered statement : though the mere expression $\dot{\eta}$ Baoth. $\dot{\eta}$ èrovp. may not occur again in the $N$. Test., still the idea of a present sovercignty and kingdom of Christ in heaven is conveyed in some passages (Eph. i. 20, Col. iii. 1), and expressed in others ( 1 Cor. xv. $25,8 a \sigma \iota \lambda u^{\prime}-$ etv) too plainly to give any cause for difficulty in the present case; compare Pearson, Creed, Art. 11. and vi. Vol. I.
p. 124, 328 (ed. Burt.). Had this expression appeared in any other than one of the Pastoral Epp., it would have passed unchallenged. On the term éroupávos, compare notes on Eph. i. 3.
$\Psi_{\S}^{\eta} \delta \delta \xi \alpha$ к. т. $\lambda$.] Observe especially this doxology to Christ; îoù סogo入oyia
 Kúpios, Theophylact. Waterland might have added this, Def. of Queries, xviI. Vol. I. p 423. On the expression cis roùs aî̂vas $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ aíwn $\omega \nu$, see notes on Gal. i. 5 .
19. Пр\{бкаעка! 'Aки́入аข] Prisca or Priscilla (Like Livia or Livilla, Drusa or Drusilla, Wetstein on Rom. xvi. 3) was the wife of Aquila of Pontus. They became first known to the apostle in Co rinth (Acts xviii. 2), whither they had come from Rome on account of the edict of Claudius; the apostle abode with them as being $\delta \mu \delta \dot{\tau} \in \chi \nu 0$, and took them with him to Syria (ver. 18). They were with him at Ephesus (surely not Corinth! Huther) when he wrote 1 Cor. (sce ch. xvi. 19), and are again noticed as being at Rome (Rom. xvi. 3) where they had probably gone temporarily, perhaps for purposes of trade : of their after history nothing is known, see Winer, $R W$ WB. s. v. 'Aquila,' Vol. I. p. 73, and Herzog, Real-Encycl. Vol. I. p. 456, who, however, ascribes their migrations to the difficulties and trials encountered in preaching the Gospel. $\tau \delta \nu{ }^{\prime} \mathrm{O} \nu \eta \sigma$. of $\kappa \circ \nu$ ] See notes on ch. i. 16. Onesiphorus is said to have been bishop of Corone in Messenia; Fabricius, Lux. Evang. p. 117 (cited by Winer). This, however, must be considered highly doubtful.

#    

20. ${ }^{2}$ Epartos] A Christian of this name is mentioned as oikovo $\mu$ (arcarius) of Corinth, Rom. xvi. 23. Mention is again made of an Erastus as having been sent from Ephesus to Macedonia with Tim., Acts xix. 22. Whether these passages relate to the same person cannot possibly be determined; but it may be said, in spite of the positive assertion of Wieseler (Chronol. p. 471) to the contrary, that the identity of the Erastus of Corinth and Erastus the missionary seems very doubtful. It is scarcely likely that the oikoyouos of Corinth would be able to act as a бıaкovồ (Acts l. c.) ; sce Meyer, Rom. l. c., and Winer, $R$ WB. s. v. Vol. 1. p. 335 ; so also Neand. Planting, Vol. 1. p. 334 (Bohn). It is perhaps more probable, from the expression $\breve{\epsilon}_{\mu} \mu \omega \nu \in \nu$ द̀ $\nu$ Kopivง̣̀, that the present Erastus was identical with Erastus of Corinth; compare Huther. All however is conjecture.
T $\rho \delta \phi \iota \mu \circ \nu$ ] 'Trophimus;' a Gentile Christian of Ephesus, who accompanied St. Paul (on his third missionary journey) from Troas (Acts xx. 4) to Miletus, Syria, and ultimately, Jerusalem, where his presence was the cause of an uproar (Acts xxi. 29). Legendary history says that he was beheaded under Nero, Menolog. Grrec. Vol. III. p. 57 (Winer).

ג̀ $\pi$ є́ $\lambda \iota \pi o \nu$ ] ' $I$ left ;' certainly not plural, 'they left,' scil. 'his comrades,' an artificial interpretation (see Winer, $R$ WB. Art. 'Trophimus' Vol. II. p. 634) which would never have been thought of, if the doubtful hypothesis of a single imprisonment of St. Paul at Rome had not seemed to require it. The supposition of Wieseler (Chronol. p. 467) that he accompanied St. Paul on his way to Rome (Acts xxvii.), but falling sick returned to Miletus in the Adramyttian ship from which

St. Paul parted at Myra (Acts xxvii. 6), may be ingenious, but seems in a high degree improbable, and is well answered by Wiesinger in his notes on this.verse, p. 684 sq. Still more hopeless is the attempt to change the reading, with the Arab. Vers., to Meतi $\uparrow \eta$, or to refer it to Miletus on the North coast of Crete, near which St. Paul never went. If we suppose this some journey later than the period recorded in the Acts (see notes on 1 Tim. i. 3), and adopt the theory of a second imprisonment, all difficulty ceases.
21. $\pi \rho \dot{\delta} \chi \in \iota \mu \bar{\omega} \nu \circ s]$ 'before winter:'. not necessarily 'before the storms of winter,' Wieseler, Chronol. p. 472. The expression seems only an amplification of
 (Chrysostom) whether by dangers on the sea (Coray), or difficulties of travelling on the land. In this repeated desire of St. Paul to see his son in the faith, and the mention of a possible cause which might detain him, we see tokens of the apostle's prescience of his approaching death; $\delta \iota \grave{\alpha} \pi \alpha ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu \quad \mu \eta \nu v ̌ \epsilon \iota ~ \tau \eta ̀ \nu \quad \tau \in \lambda \epsilon \nu \tau \grave{\eta} \nu$, Theodoret.
 к. т. 入.] Of Eubulus, Pudens, and Clau dia, nothing certain is known; they were not companions of the apostle (verse 11), but only members of the Church at Rome. The identity of the two latter with the Pudens and Claudia of Martial (Epigr. xv. 13, xr. 34) seems very doubtful ; see, however, Conyb. and Howson, St. Paul, Vol. 11. p. 595 (ed. 2), Alford, Prolegom. Vol. 111. p. 104. Linus is in all probability the first bishop of Rome of that name ; see Irenæus, Har. ini. 3, Euseb. Hist. III. 2.
22. $\mu \in \tau \grave{\alpha}$ тô $\pi \nu \in \dot{v} \mu$.] 'with thy spirit ;' so Gal. vi. 18, Philem. 25. The apostle names the 'spirit' as the 'potior pars' in our nature, see notes on Gal. l. c. $\mu a \tau o ́ s ~ \sigma o v . ~ \grave{\eta} \chi a ́ p ı s ~ \mu \epsilon \mathscr{S}^{\prime} \dot{\nu} \mu \bar{\omega} \nu$.
22. Kúpoos 'I $\eta \sigma o$ ûs Xpıorós] So Rec., Griesb., Scholz, with CDEKL ; al.; Syr., Vulg., al. Lachmann reads $\delta$ Kúp. 'I $\eta \sigma o u ̂ s ~ w i t h ~ A ; ~ 31.114 ; ~ T i s c h . ~ r e a d s ~ o n l y ~ K u ́-~$ pios with FG; 17. al. ; Boern., 鹿th. Though an interpolation is not improbable, yet the uncial authority for the omission seems very weak ; F and G are little more than equivalent to one authority.

There is no allusion to the Holy Spirit sâ' (Mill, Prolegom. p. 86), as there is (Chrys. al.), nor to $\pi \nu \in \nu \mu a \tau \iota \kappa \grave{\eta} \chi^{\alpha} \rho ı s$ no mention throughout the Epistle of the (Ecumen.) ; the $\pi \nu \in \hat{v} \mu \alpha$ is the human Church at Ephesus; but simply 'with $\pi \nu \epsilon \bar{v} \mu a$ (not merely the $\psi v \chi \dot{\eta}$, Coray), thee and those with thee.' This benethe third and highest part in man ; com- diction is somewhat singular as being pare Olshausen, Opusc. vi. p. 145 sq., and Destiny of Creature, p. 115. $\mu \in \mathcal{N}$ ' $\dot{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu]$ 'with you;' not exactly 'tecum et cum totâ ecclesiâ tibi commistwofold, to Timothy separately, and to Timothy and those with him: 1 Cor Xvi. 23,24 , is also twofold, but to the same persons.

## THE EPISTLE T0 TITUS.

## INTRODUCTION.

The Epistle to Titus was written by St. Paul apparently only a short time after his missionary visit to the island of Crete (ch. i. 5), and when on his way to Nicopolis to winter (ch. iv. 12). On the occasion of that visit he had left his previous companion, Titus, in charge of the churches of that island, and may not unreasonably be supposed to have availed himself of an early opportunity of writing special instructions to him concerning the duties with which he had been entrusted (ch. i. 5).

If we are correct in supposing that the Nicopolis above alluded to was the well-known city of that name in Epirus (see notes on ch. iv. 12), we may conceive this Epistle to have been written from some place in Asia Minor, perhaps Ephesus (Conyb. and Hows. St. Paul, Vol. xr. p. 566, ed. 2) [p. 460 , Am. ed.], at which the apostle might have stayed a short time previous to the westward journey. If we further adopt the not unreasonable supposition that the apostle was arrested soon after his arrival at Nicopolis, and forwarded from thence to Rome (Conyb. and Hows. loc. cit.), and also agree to consider the year of his martyrdom (see Introd. to 2 Tim.), we may roughly fix the date of this Epistle as the summer of A.D. 66 or 67, according as we adopt the earlier or later date for the apostle's martyrdom. Whichever date we select, it will clearly be most natural to suppose that the winter alluded to in this Epistle (ch. iv. 12) is not the same as that referred to in 2 Tim. iv. 21, but belongs to the year before it. If we suppose them the same (comp. Alford, Prolegom. Vol. iur. p. 97), the occurrences of 2 Tim. will seem somewhat unduly crowded; compare Conyb. and Hows. St. Paul, Vol. Ir. p. 573, note (ed. 2) [p. 467, Am. ed.].

The object of the Epistle transpires very clearly from its contents. The apostle not having been able to remain long enough in Crete to complete the necessary organization of the various churches in the island, but having left Titus to complete this responsible work, sends to him all necessary instruction.
both in respect of the discipline, ecclesiastical (ch. i. 5 sq., comp. ch. iii. 10) and general (ch. ii. 1 sq., ch. iii. 1 sq.), which he was to maintain, and the erroneous teaching which he was to be ready to confront (ch. i. 13 sq. , ch. iii. 9, al.). The Cretan character had long been unfavorably spoken of (ch. i. 12), and, as we learn from this Epistle, with so much truth (ch. i. 13, 16, ch. iii. 1 sq .), that though Titus was instructed by the apostle to come to him at Nicopolis (ch. iii. 12), but a short time probably after he would have received the Epistle, it was deemed fitting by the apostle that he should have written instructions for his immediate guidance. On the adaptation of the contents to the object of the writer, see Davidson, Introduction, Vol. iII. p. 90 sq.

On the genuineness and authenticity of the Epistle see the Introduction to the First Epistle to Timothy. The Pastoral Epistles in regard to this question must be regarded as a whole; no writer of credit, except Schleiermacher, having failed to admit that they must all be attributed to one writer.

## TIIE EPISTLE T0 TITUS.

## CHAPTER I.

## Apostolic address and palutation.




1. 'Inбov̂ Xpıơoû] So Lachm. with $\mathrm{D}^{3} \mathrm{EFGHJK}$; mss. (Rec., Griesb., Scholz, De W., and Huth. (e sil.) ; the order is inverted by Tisch. only with A; 3 mss. ; Tol., Copt., Syr.-Phil. ; Ambrst. (ed.), Cassiod. There certainly does not seem sufficient authority for any change of the received text in the present case; indeed it may be remarked that Tisch. appears to have been somewhat precipitate in always maintaining the sequence ${ }^{\alpha} \pi \sigma \sigma \tau \tau$. $\mathrm{X}_{\rho}$. ' $\mathrm{I} \eta \sigma$. in St. Paul's introductory salutations. In 1 Cor. i. 1, and 2 Tim. i. 1, certainly, in Col. i. 1, and 1 Tim. i. 1, probably, and perhaps in Eph. i. 1, and Phil. i. 1 ( $\delta o \hat{\lambda} \lambda o \iota$ ), this order may be adopted; but in Rom. i. 1 ( $\delta o u ̂ \lambda o s), 2$ Cor. i. l, and here, it seems most insufficiently supported, and is rightly rejected by Lachmumn. It is not perhaps too much to say that some passing thought in the apostle's mind may have often suggested a variation in order; in ver. 4, for example, X $\rho$. 'I $\eta \sigma$. (Tisch.) seems more probable, 'I $\eta \sigma o \hat{u}$ and $\sigma \omega \tau \bar{\eta} p o s$ being thus brought in more immediate contact. It is not well to be hypercritical, but variations even in these frequently recurring words should not wholly be passed over.

Chapter I. 1. $\delta o \hat{v} \lambda o s$ © $0 \hat{v}$ ] ' $a$ servant of God;' the more general designation succeeded by $\dot{\alpha} \pi \delta \dot{\sigma} \tau$. к. т. $\lambda$. the more special. On all other occasions St. Paul terms himself סov̂خos 'I X., Rom. i. 1, Phil. i. 1, comp. Gal. i. 10 ; so also James i. 1, 2 Pet. i. 1, Jude 1, comp. Rev. i. 1. Surely a forger would not have made a deviation so very noticeable: in salutations more than in anything else peculiarities would have been avoided. The expression itself occurs

Acts xvi. 17, Rev. xv. 3, compare ib. x. 7 ; and in a slightly different application, 1 Pet. ii. 16, Rev. vii. 3.
$\left.\dot{\alpha} \pi \dot{\alpha} \sigma \tau o \lambda o s \delta^{\epsilon}\right]$ 'and further an apos$t l e$, 'etc. ; more exact definition. The $\delta \dot{\epsilon}$ here has not its full antithetical force (Mack), but, as in Jude 1, appears only to distinguish and specify by the notice of another relation in which the subject stood to another genitive ; see especially Klotz, Devar. Vol. 1I. p. 359 ; compare Winer, Gr. § 53. 7. b, p. 393, and the
list of examples (though not very critically arranged) in Ellendt, Lex. Soph. Vol. II. p. 388. Forgetfulness of this common, perhaps even primary (comp. Donalds. Cratyl. § 155) use of $\delta$ é has led several expositors into needlessly artificial and elliptical translations ; compare even Peile in loc.
$\kappa \alpha \tau \alpha$ $\pi\{\sigma \tau t \nu \kappa . \tau . \lambda$.$] 'for the fuith of God's$ elect ;' the $\pi\{\sigma \tau i s \tau \omega \bar{\nu} \epsilon \kappa \lambda$. is the destination of the apostleship : not 'secundum fidem,' Vulg., Clarom., which, though defended by Matthies, seems very unsatisfactory; the faith or knowledge of individuals cannot, without much explaining away (compare Peile), ever be the rule or norma of the apostle's office. The meaning is thus nearly as enunciated by 'Theophylact, $\pi \rho \partial s, \tau \delta \pi เ \sigma \tau \epsilon \bar{v} \sigma a l$ тoùs $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \lambda \epsilon \kappa \tau$ oùs $\delta i^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \epsilon \mu 0 \hat{v}$, scarcely so much as $\nu \grave{\alpha}$
 (Coray), and the sentiment is parallel to Rom. i. 5. Though it may be admitted that the idea of 'object,' 'intention,' is more fully expressed by cis and $\pi$ pós (Matth.), it still seems hopeless to deny
 Thucyd. vr. 31, ка今' ápтaүमע, Xenoph. Anab. 11. 5. 3, al., plainly points to and implies some idea of purpose ; see Rost u. Palm, Lex. s. v. in. 3, Vol. i. p. 1598, Jelf, Gr. § 629. If it be not undue refinement, we may say that in the three prepositions, eis, тpós, кará, 'object' is expressed in its highest degree by the first, and in its lowest by the last ; but that the two former are very near to each other in meaning, while katà does not rise much above the idea of 'special reference to,' 'destination for.' We might thus perhaps say eis rather marks immediate purpose, трд̀s ultimate purpose, ката̀ destination: compare notes on Eph. iv. 12. These distinctions must however be applied with great caution. It need scarcely be said that there is here no pa-
renthesis; see Winer, Gr. § 62. 4, p. 499. $\epsilon \kappa \lambda \in \kappa \tau \circ \bar{\omega} \nu \quad \Theta \in \circ \hat{\nu}]$ 'the chosen of God.' There is nothing proleptic in the expression, sc. T $\hat{\xi} s \dot{e}^{\kappa} \kappa \lambda o-$ $\gamma \hat{\eta} s$ roùs $\dot{\alpha} \xi \mathfrak{l}$ ous, Theodoret, and more expressly, De Wette: the faith of the elect ' forms one compound idea, it is on the rifors rather than the defining genitive that the moment of thought principally rests. Nay, further, Acts xiii. 48 shows this, - that election is not in consequence of faith, but faith in consequence of election; compare Eph. i. 4, and notes in loc. $\quad \epsilon \pi\{\gamma \nu \omega \sigma \iota \nu$ $\left.\dot{\alpha} \lambda_{\eta} \geqslant.\right]$ ' full knowledge of the truth;' i.e. of evangelical truth, compare Eph. i. 13 ; 'in hoc, inquit, missus sum apostolus ut clecti per me credant et cognoscant veritatem,' Estius. 'A入ńņcia has thus reference to the object (surely not to be resolved into a mere adjective, $\tau \hat{\eta} s$ ả $\lambda \eta$ ฟิเ $\nu \hat{\eta} s$ $\epsilon \dot{j} \sigma \in \beta$., Coray), दों $\pi \gamma \nu \omega \sigma t s$ to the subject ; on the latter ('accurata cognitio') see notes on Eph. i. 17. 'This 'truth' is defined more exactly by the clause $\tau \hat{\eta} s \kappa a \tau^{\prime}$
 1 Tïn, iii. $13 . \quad \kappa \alpha \tau^{\prime} \in \dot{v} \sigma \xi^{\prime}-$ $\beta \in l a \nu$ may be translated 'according to godliness' (see notes on 1 Tim. vi 3), but as Gospel truth can scarcely be said to be conformable to e $\dot{u} \sigma$ '́ $B \in i a$ (still less to be 'rcgulated by' it, Alf.) and as it is not probable that the preposition would be used in the same sentence in different senses, the more natural meaning seems, 'which is (designed) for godliness,' scil. which is ' most naturally productive of holy living and a pious conversation, South, Serm. 5, Vol, IIr. p. 214 (Tearg). The meaning adopted by Huth., 'which is allied to' (' bezeichnet die Angehürigkeit'), even in such passages as Rom. $x$. 2, is more than doubtful ; see Winer, Gr. § 49. d, p. 359. On the meaning of ci $\sigma_{\epsilon} \beta \in i a$, see notes on 1 Tim. ii. 2 .



hope of eternal life,' - not 'in spem,' Vulg., Clarom., Goth. ('du') : comp. Rom. iv. 18, viii. 20, 1 Cor. ix. 10 : hope is the basis on which all rests, see Winer, Gr. § 48. c, p. 349. The connection of the clause is not perfectly clear ; it can hardly be connected with $\dot{a} \pi \delta \dot{\sigma} \tau 0 \lambda o s$, as it would thus form a co-ordinate clause to кard̀ mícTiv к. т. $\lambda$., and would more naturally be introdnced by some specifying particle; nor can it be attached to $\dot{\epsilon} \pi i \gamma \nu \omega \sigma \iota \nu \kappa$. $\tau . \lambda_{0}$, as this would violate the close union $\pi i \sigma \tau t s$ and $\epsilon \pi i \gamma \nu$. We must then, with De Wette and Huther, and, as it would seem, Chrys. and Theodoret, refer it to the whole clause, karà $\pi i \sigma \tau \iota \nu-\epsilon \dot{v} \sigma \epsilon \in \beta \epsilon \iota \alpha \nu$ : the apostle's calling had for its destination the faith of the elect and the knowledge of the truth, and the basis on which all this rested was the hope of eternal life.
द̇ $\pi \eta \gamma \gamma \in โ \lambda \alpha \tau$ o] 'promised,' ' proclaimed, sc, in the way of a promise; so Rom. iv. 21, Gal. iii. 19. The force and truth of the $\dot{\epsilon \pi} \pi \gamma \gamma \in \lambda\{\alpha$ is then enhanced by the unique expression (in the N. T.), a $\psi \in v$ $\delta \grave{s}$ ©és; compare, however, for the sentiment, Heb. vi. 18, and for the expression, Eurip. Orest. 364, Глаûкаs à $\psi \in u \delta \grave{\eta} s$

$\pi \rho \delta \chi \rho \delta \nu \omega \nu$ ai $\omega-$ $\nu\{\omega \nu]$ 'before eternal times.' It is not easy to decide whether $\chi$ póvol aíuvio are here to be considered ( $a$ ) as equivalent to $\pi \rho \delta \tau^{\omega} \omega \bar{\nu}$ aíw$\omega \omega \nu$ (Theod., Alf., Wordsworth, al.), as in 2 Tim, i. 9 , or (b) as simply 'very ancient times' (ed. 1. Wiesing.), тол入oùs каl $\mu$ акройs $\chi$ रóvous (Coray) ; comp. Calv. in loc. In favor of (b) is the reflection that though it may be truly said that God loved us from all eternity (CEcum.), it still cannot strictly be said that $\langle\omega\rangle \grave{\eta}$ aíwnos was promised before all eternity (see Hammond in loc.) : in favor of $(a)$ is the use of aiculos in the preceding member, and the partial paral-
lel afforded by 2 Tim. i. 9. On careful reconsideration the preponderance is perhaps to be regarded as slightly in favor of (a) and the $\dot{\epsilon}^{\prime} \lambda \pi i s$ itself and general counsels relating to it, rather than the specific promise of it, to be conceived as mainly referred to.
3. E' $\phi \propto \nu \epsilon \prime \rho \omega \sigma \in \nu \delta \epsilon \in\}$ 'but manifested;' in practical though not verbal antithesis to $\dot{e} \pi \eta \gamma \gamma{ }^{\prime}(\lambda a \tau o$, ver. 2 ; the primary є̇тa $\gamma \gamma \in \AA$ ía (Gen. iii. 15), yea, even the cardinal $\epsilon \pi a \gamma \gamma \in \lambda i \alpha$ to Abraham (Gal. iii. 8) required some further revelation to make it fully фavepóv. The more strict antithesis occurs in Coloss. i. 26, where, however, the allusion was different ; compare Rom. xvi. 25, 26, 2 Tim i. 9,10 . The accus. objecti after '̇申avé$p \omega \sigma e \nu$ is clearly $\tau \partial \nu \nu\left\langle\sigma^{\prime} 0 \nu\right.$ av̉rov̂, not $\zeta \omega h \nu$ (CEum., al.), or $\bar{\epsilon} \lambda \pi t \delta \alpha ~ \zeta \omega \hat{\eta} s$ (Heinr.). The apostle changes the accus. for the sake of making his language more exact; Swì aiwulos was, strictly speaking, in regard of its appearance, future : the Gospel included both it and all things, whether referring to the present or the future ; see Theophyl. in loc., who has explained the structure clearly and correctly.
$\kappa \alpha \iota \rho \circ$ is is iols] 'in his own,' i.e. 'in due seasons ;' тoîs áp $\mu$ ó̧ovat, toîs $\omega \emptyset \in \lambda \eta$ $\mu$ évols, Theophyl. On the expression and the peculiar nature of the dat., see notes on 1 Tim. ii. 6. Here and in 1 Tim. vi. 15 (compare Acts i. 7), the reference to the subject, God, is so distinct that the more literal translation may be maintained.
 'His word,' i. e. as more fully defined by द้̇ кпри́ $\gamma \mu a \tau \iota$ к. $\tau . \lambda$., the Gospel, which was the revelation both of the primal mystery (Rom. xvi 26), and all succeeding èmayy $\ell\{a$, and was amnounced to man in the к $\eta$ puyua of the Lord and His. apostles. To refer it to the Logos, with Jerome, CEcum., and others, is wholly



unsatisfactory. On the change of construction, see Winer, G'r. § 63.1, p. 501, where numerous examples are cited of far more striking anacolutha.
 was intrusted ;' on this construction, see Winer, Gr. §32. 5, p. 204, and compare notes on Gal. ii. 7.
$k \alpha \tau^{\prime}$
 commandment of our Saviour God;' so, only with a slight change of order, 1 Tim . i. 1. It has been suggested that the Second Person of the biessed Trinity may be here intended ; compare notes on ch. iii. 6, and Usteri, Lehrb. II. 2. 4, p. 310 : the analogy of 1 Tim. i. 1 , renders this, and perhaps also ch. ii. 11 , very doubtful. The ákototiotov implied in the of eimıorevianv (Chrys.) is further defined and enhanced by the declaration that it was not ' proprio motu,' but in obedience to a special command; see notes on 1 Tim. l. c., where the clause is considered more at length.
4. T\{T $\omega \gamma \nu \eta \sigma t \omega \tau \epsilon \in \kappa \nu \omega]$ ' 10 Titus, my true (genuine) child.' The receiver of this epistle is far too distinctly mentioned to make the supposition admissible that it was addressed (comp. iii. 15) to the Church, see Wiesing. Einleit. 1. 1, p. 260. Of Titus comparatively little is known. His name does not occur in the Acts, but from the Epistles we find that he was a Greek (Gal. ii. 3), converted, as the present verse seems to imply, by St. Paul himself, and with the apostle at Jerusalem on his thind visit (notes on Gal. ii. 1). He was sent by St. Paul, when at Ephesus, to Corinth (2 Cor. vii. 6), on some unknown commission (Meyer on 2 Cor. p. 3), possibly with some reference to a collection ( 2 Cor. viii. $6, \pi \rho$ o $e v \eta \dot{p} \xi \alpha_{-}$$\tau 0)$; is again with the apostle in Macedonia (2 Cor. ii. 13, compare with vii.
5), and is sent by him with the second Epistle to Corinth (2 Cor: viii. 6, 16 sq .). The remaining notices of Titus are supplied by the Pastoral Epistles; see 2 Tim. iv: 10, Tit. i. 5 sq., iii. 12. According to tradition, Titus was bishop of Crete (Euseb. Hist. 111. 4), and died on that island (Isid. de Vit. Sanct. 87) ; see Winer, $R$ WB. s. v. 'Titus,' Vol. r1. p. 625, and compare Acta Sanct. (Jan. 4), Vol. x. p. 163. On the expression $\gamma \nu \eta$ $\sigma^{\prime}(\omega$ Tér $\kappa \nu \varphi$, see notes on 1 Tim. i. 2.
$\kappa \alpha \tau \grave{\alpha} \kappa o i \nu \grave{\eta} \nu \pi\{\sigma \tau t \nu \mid$ ' in respect of (our) common faith;' 'fidei respectu quæ quidem et Paulo patri et Tito filio communis erat,' Beza, $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ ả $\delta \eta \lambda \phi \delta \partial \tau \eta \tau \alpha$ ク̀ $\nu \zeta \xi$ aro, Chrys.: a reference to the frith that was common to them and all Christians (Bengel, Wiesing.) would, as Jerome suggests, be here too general. Grotius finds in kowds a reference to the Grecks in the person of Titus, and to the Jews in the person of St. Paul; this seems 'argutius quam verius dictum.'
$\chi$ doıs кal єip $\eta \boldsymbol{\eta} \eta]$ For an explanation of this form of Christian salutation, see notes on Gal. i. 2, and on Eph. i. 2. There seems enough authority to justify Tisch. in his insertion of kal, and the omission of the more individualizing ${ }_{\epsilon} \lambda$ eoos, with C1DEFG; 73. 137; Vulgate, Clarom., Copt., Syr., ङth.-Platt, Arm.; Chrys. (expressly), and many others. The reading, however, cannot be pronounced certain, as ${ }^{2} \lambda$ ceos (Rec.) is retained in ACNKL ; Syr.-Phil., al.; Theod., al., and is adopted by Lachmann. The addition $\tau o \hat{v} \sigma \omega \tau \hat{\eta} \rho o s$ in $\mu \omega \hat{\nu}$ to $\mathrm{X} \rho$. 'I $\eta \sigma$. (comp. iii: 6), is peculiar to this salutation.
5. $\dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon \in \lambda \iota \pi \delta \nu \quad \sigma \in \kappa . \tau . \lambda$.$] ' I$ left thee in Crete. When this happened can only be conjectured. The various attempts to bring this circumstance within

I lefc thee in Crete to ordsin elders, who must have all high moral qualities and teach sound doctrine.



the time included in the Acts of the Apostles (compare Wieseler, Chronol. p. 329 sq.) seem all unsatisfactory, and have been well investigated by Wiesing., Einleit. 1. 4. p. 272 sq., and (in answer to Wieseler) p. 360. Language, historical notices, and the advanced state of Christianity in that island, alike seem to lead us to fix the date of the epistle near to that of I Tim., and of this journey as not very long after the apostle's release from his first imprisonment at Rome; see Neander, Planting, Vol. I. p. 338 sq. (Bohn), Conyb. and Howson St. Paul, Vol. II. p. 565 (ed. 2), Guerike, Einleit. § 48. 1, p. 396 (ed. 2). There seems no sufficient reason for supposing, with Ne ander (p. 342), that Christianity was planted in Crete by St. Paul on this occasion ; reorganized it might have been, but planted by him it scarcely could have been, as the whole tenor of the epistle leads to the supposition that it had been long established, and had indeed taken sufficient root to break out into heresies. Christianity might have been planted there after one of the early dispersions ; Cretans were present at tho Pentecostal miracle (Acts ii. 11) : sec esp. Wiesing. on ver. 5.
$\tau \grave{\alpha} \lambda \in\{\pi o \nu \tau a]$ 'the things that are lacking;' 'quæ ego per temporis brevitatem non potui expedire,' Beng. The more special directions at once follow.
$\dot{\epsilon} \pi เ \delta เ \circ \rho \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\omega} \sigma \eta$ ] 'further set in order;' the prep. ${ }^{\boldsymbol{e} \pi i}$, according to its common force in compos., denotes 'insuper; 'St.
 Beng. The reading is far from certain, but on the whole Tisch. seems to have rightly adopted the middle; the form
 ported (AEI ; compare $\mathrm{D}^{1}$ èmavopì $\sigma \sigma \eta \mathrm{s}$, and FG $\delta \in t o p \uparrow \uparrow \omega ́ \sigma \eta s)$, might have had its
termination suggested by rataбтท́бך̣s below. The middle it must be owned has here scarcely any force (Winer, Gr. § 38 . 6, p. 230), unless it be taken as an instance of what is now called an intensive or 'dynamic' middle; see Krüger, Sprachl. § 52.8 sq., and comp. notes on 1 Tim. iv. 6. $\kappa \alpha \tau \grave{\alpha} \pi \delta^{\lambda} \lambda \nu$ ] ' in every city,' 'from city to city;' 'oppidatim,' Calvin ; compare Acts xiv. 23,
 $\tau$ t́pous (Tïsch.), and as regards the expression, Luke viii. 1 , Acts xv. 21, xx. 23. The deduction of Bp. Taylor, 'one in one city, many in many ' (Episc. § 15 ), is certainly precarious. On the connection between razà and à $\nu \alpha$, both in this distributive, and in other senses, see Donalds. Cratyl. § 183 sq.
©́s ह่ $\gamma \dot{\omega} \kappa$ к. $\tau . \lambda$.$] 'as I directed thee ;'$ in reference, as De W. says, not only to the 'Dass,' but the 'Wie,' as the following requisitions further explain; the apostle not only bid Titus perform this duty, but taught him how to do it wisely and efficiently. This verb is more commonly. (in the $\mathrm{N} . \mathrm{T}_{\text {.) active when joined }}$ with a dat. (Matth. xi. 1, 1 Cor. ix. 14, xvi. 1), the middle, however (with dat.), occurs Acts xxiv. 23. This again seems more a 'dynamic ' middle than the ordinary middle ' of interest.' The force of the compound סıará $\sigma \sigma \omega$ may be felt in the 'dispositio, sc. corum quæ incomposita vel implicata et perplexa erant ' (compare 1 Cor. xi. 34), which a directive command tacitly involves : see Winer, de Verb. Comp. Fasc. v. p. 7.
6. $\epsilon$ Itis к. т. $\lambda_{\text {. ] ' 'if amy one be unac- }}$ cused, have nought laid to his charge;' ei $\mu \eta \delta \epsilon i s$ ě $\sigma \chi \in \nu$ ė $\pi เ \sigma \kappa \hat{\eta} \psi \alpha a t$ èv $\tau \hat{\eta} \zeta \omega \hat{\eta}$, Chrys. The form of expression certainly does not seem intended to imply that it was probable few such would be found (com-


pare Heydenr.) ; it only generally marks the class to which the future presbyter was necessarily to belong. For the exact meaning of $\dot{\alpha} \nu \dot{\nu} \hat{\gamma} \gamma \lambda$. ('sine crimine,' Vulg.), see notes on 1 Tim. iii. 10, and Tittm. Synon. r. p. 31.
$\mu เ \tilde{u} s \gamma v \nu a b \kappa \delta s \dot{\alpha} \nu \dot{n} \rho]$ ' $a$ husband of one wife:' for the meaning of this expression see notes on 1 Tim. iii. 2. The remark of Chrysostom may be here adduced, as certainly illustrative of the opinion held in the early Church ; Іั $\sigma \epsilon \epsilon$


 кат $\eta \gamma$ орias. $\tau$ є́к $\nu \propto \kappa . \tau . \lambda$.] 'having belicving children;" the emphasis seems to rest on $\pi \iota \sigma \tau \alpha$; the Christian $\pi \rho \in \sigma \beta \dot{u} \tau \in \rho o s$ was not to have heathen, Judaizing, or merely nominally-believing children; comp. 1 Tim. iii. 4, 5, where this requisition is more fully expressed. The expression, not perhaps without reason, has been urged as a hint that Christianity had been established in Crete for some time.
$\epsilon^{\epsilon} \nu \kappa \alpha \tau \eta \gamma \circ \rho\{\underset{\sim}{\alpha}$ к. т. $\lambda$.] ' not in accusation of dissoluteness,' i. e. 'not accused of,' etc., Auth. Ver. The кatทropia (John xviii. 29, 1 Tim. v. 19) is. as it were, something in which they might be involved, and out of which they were to take care to be al-
 [ $\epsilon i \pi \epsilon \epsilon \dot{\alpha} \pi \lambda \omega \hat{s} \mu \eta े \check{\alpha} \sigma$. , conject. Bened.],
 Chrysost. On the meaning and derivation of $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \omega \tau\{\alpha$, see notes on $E p h . v .18$.
ל) $\dot{\alpha} \nu v \pi \delta \tau a \kappa \tau \alpha]$ 'or unruly,' scil. disobedient to their parents ; the reason is more fully given, 1 Timothy iii. 5, paraphrased by Theophyl., $\delta$ ү $\dot{\alpha} \rho$ т $\alpha$ oikeia
 For the meaning of àvvaó ., see notes on 1 Tim. i. 9.
7. $\tau \delta \nu \quad \dot{\epsilon} \pi[\sigma \kappa \circ \pi \circ \nu]$ 'every bishop,'
or, according to our idiom, ' $a$ bishop;' on the article see notes.on Gal. iii. 20 ; and on the meaning of the term $\dot{\epsilon} \pi i \sigma \kappa$., and its relation to $\pi \rho \in \sigma \beta$ úr $\epsilon \rho \circ$ s, see notes on 1 Tim. iii. 1. The apostle here changes the former designation into the one that presents the subject most clearly in his official capacity, the one in which his relations to those under his rule would be most necessary to be defined. The excellent treatise of Bp. Pearson, Minor Works, Vol. 1. p. 271 sq., may be added to the list of works on episcopacy noticed on 1 Tim. l.c. : his positions are that episcopal government was 'sub Apostolis, ab Apostolis, in Apostolis,' p. 278.
$\dot{\omega} s$ © $\in \hat{\imath}$ o ikov.] 'as bring Giod's steward;' Өєov̂ not without prominence and emphasis. While the previous title is enhanced and expanded, the leading requisition (ảעध́ $\kappa \kappa \lambda$.) is made more evidently necessary from the position occupied by the subject : he must indecd be à $\nu^{\prime} \gamma-$ $\kappa \lambda \eta$ rov, as he is a steward of the olkos ©eov, the Church of the living God (1 Tim. iii. 15). On this use of $\dot{\omega} s$, see notes on Eph. v. 28. Both on this account, and the more pregnant meaning of oiко$\nu \delta \mu o s, 1$ Cor. iv. 1 (compare 1 Peter iv. 10 ) is not a strict parallel of this passage. $\quad \mu \grave{\eta} \alpha \dot{v}, \alpha \dot{\alpha} \delta \eta$ ] 'not. self-willed;' not, in a derivative sense, 'haughty,' Goth. (háuh-háirts'), but, as Syriac correctly, though somewhat para-
 [ductus voluntate sui-ipsius] ; т $\boldsymbol{\nu} \nu \delta \delta^{\prime}$ aท̀-
 Vol, II. p 199. The adjective, as its derivation suggests ( $\alpha u ̈ \tau \delta s$, $\} \delta \delta o \mu a \iota$ ), implies a self-loving spirit, which in seeking only to gratify itself is regardless of others,
 $\mu \omega ́ \delta \eta s, \pi \alpha p \alpha \alpha^{2} \mu \mu o s$. Hesych. ; rightly defined as 'qui se non accommodat aliis, id-

#   

coque omnibus incommodus est, morosus,' Tittm. Synon. 1. p. 74 ; see espec. Theophrast. Charact. xv., [Aristot.] M. Moral. 1. 29, the essay on this word in Raphel, Annot. Vol. IY. p. 626, and the numerous examples in Wetst, in loc., and Elsmer, Obs. Vol. 11. p. 320. It occurs in the N. T. only here and 2 Pet. ii. 10,


Winer has here remarked that $\mu \grave{\eta}$ rather than ou is properly used; as the qualities are marked which the assumed model bishop ought to have to correspond to his office ( $\mathrm{I}^{\prime} r$. § 59. 4. obs., p. 566, ed. 5,-apparently withdrawn from ed. 6) : in a general point of view, the observation is just, but in this particular case the $\mu \eta$ is probably due to the objective form of the sentence in which it stands; sce Donalds. Gr. § 594. ópy[रov], 'soon angry,' 'irascible;' $\ddot{\alpha} \pi$. $\lambda \in \gamma \dot{\phi} \mu$. in N. 'T.; thus specially defined by Aristotle (Ethic IV.


 lengthened termination - tos, especially in - $\eta \lambda o ́ s,-\omega \lambda o ́ s$, denotes 'habit,' 'custom,' Buttm. Gr. § 119. i3. On the two following epithets, $\pi \dot{\alpha} \rho o w v o{ }^{2}$ and $\pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \kappa \tau \eta \nu$, see notes on 1 Tim. iii. 3, and on ai $\sigma \chi \rho \circ \kappa \in \rho \delta \bar{\eta}$, ib. iii. 8, and compare below, ver. 11.
8. $\phi เ \lambda \delta \xi \in \nu \circ \nu]$ 'hospitable;' so 1 Tim. iii. 2, compare v. 10, 3 John 5, 6. This hospitality, as Conybeare remarks, worild be especially shown when Christiuns travelling from one place to another were received and forwarded on their journey by their brethren. The precept must not, however, be too much limited; compare Heb. xiii. 2.
$\phi \iota \lambda \& \gamma \propto \approx$ o $\nu$ ] 'a lover of good,' 'benignum,' Vulg., Clarom.; see notes on 2 Tim. ii. 3. Here at first sight the masculine reference ('bonorum amantem,'

Jerome) might seem more plausible as following $\phi เ \lambda \delta \xi_{\xi} \in \nu 0 \nu$ (Est.) ; still, on the other hand, the transition from the special to the general, from hospitality to love of good and benevolence, would appear no less appropriate; see Wisdom vii. 22, where the reference (though so asserted in Schleusner, Lex. s. v.) does not seem to persons. Both meanings are probably admissible (Rost u. Palm, Lex. s. v.), but the analogy of similar compounds (e. g. $\left.\phi \stackrel{\lambda}{ } \delta_{k} \alpha \lambda o s\right)$ would point rather to the neuter.
$\sigma \omega \phi \rho \circ \nu a]$ 'discreet,' or 'sober-minded;' see notes on 1 Tim. ii. 9, where the meaning of $\sigma \omega \phi p o \sigma \psi \nu \eta$ is briefly investigated. $\delta i \kappa \alpha \iota \circ \nu, \delta \sigma เ 0 \nu]$ 'righteous, holy;' comp. 1 Thess. ii. 10, Eph. iv. 24. The ordinary distinction recapitulated by Hu -
 స̦oùs ö́los (sce Plato, Gorg. p. 507 B), does not seem sufficiently exact and comprehensive for the N. Test. $\Delta i$ ikalos, as Tittmann observes, 'recte dicitur, et qui jus fasque servat, et qui facit quoci honestum et æquum postulat,' Synon. 1. p. 21 : öaros, as the same author admits (p.25), is more allied with á $\gamma \nu o$ ós, and, as Harless has shown (Euhes. p. 427), involves rather the idea of a 'holy purity,' see notes on Eph. iv. 24. The derivation of öatos seems very doubtful; see Pott, Etym. Forsch. Vol. I. p. 126, compared with Benfey, Wurzellex. Vol. I. p. 436. $\left.\mathcal{\epsilon}^{\boldsymbol{\gamma}} \gamma \kappa \rho \propto \tau \hat{\eta}\right]$ 'tennperate; ' $\alpha \pi$. $\lambda \in \gamma \delta \mu$. in N. T., but the subst. occurs in Acts xxiv. 25 , Gal. v. 23, 2 P'et. i. 6, and the (nearly unique) verb in I Corinth. vii. 9, ix. 25. The meaning is sufficiently clear from the derivation ( $\tau \delta \nu \pi \dot{\alpha}$ íous крато̂̂vтa, $\tau \delta \nu$
 $\lambda \alpha^{\prime} \sigma \tau \omega \nu$, Chrys.), and though of course very pertinent in respect of 'libido' (compare De Wette), need in no way be limited in its application; compare Sui-



cer，Thesaurus s．v．Vol I．page 1000. 9．$\dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \in \chi o ́ \mu \in \nu 0 \nu]$＇holding fast：＇ comp．Matth．vi．24，Luke xvi．13，and in a somewhat more restricted sense 1 Thess．v．14， $\mathfrak{\alpha} \nu \tau \epsilon \chi$ ．$\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \vec{a} \sigma \hat{\vartheta} \epsilon \nu \hat{\omega} \nu$ ．The $\dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \grave{l}$ appears to involve a faint idea of holding out against something hostile or opposing（comp．Rost u．Palm，Lex．s．v．）， which，however，passes into that of stead－ fast application to，etc．；e．g．Tท̂s సָa入 $\alpha \sigma$－ $\sigma \eta s$ ，Thucyd．1．13，Polyb．1．58， 3 ；Є̇ $\lambda$－ $\pi i \delta o s ~ \mu \eta \delta \in \mu: a ̂ s$, Polyb．I．56．9，in which latter author the word is very common ； see Schweigh．Lex．Polyb．s．v．
$\tau 0 \hat{v} \kappa \alpha \tau \grave{\alpha}-\kappa . \tau . \lambda$.$] ＇the faithful word$ according to the teaching；＇i．e．the true， Christian doctrine set forth by，and agree－ ing with apostolic teaching；compare 2
 ib．iii．14，$\mu \in ́ \nu \in{ }^{\prime} \nu \nu$ ois ${ }^{\circ} \mu \alpha \hat{\mu} \in s$ ．There is some slight difficulty in the explanation． The position of the words shows plainly that there are not two distinct specifica－ tions in respect of the $\lambda$ obos（Heydenr．）， but one in respect of the $\pi \iota \sigma \tau \partial s \lambda \delta \gamma o s$, viz．， that it is $\kappa a \tau \grave{\alpha} \delta i o ̄ a \chi \eta ̀ \nu, ~ ' e u m ~ q u i ~ s e c u n-~$ dum doctrinam est fidelem sermonem，＇ Vulg．：the only doubt is what meanings are to be assigned to kat⿳亠 and $\delta \iota \delta a \chi \eta$ ； is it（a）＇sure with respect to teaching others＇（＇verba ipsius sint regula verita－ tis，＇Jerome），סıōax $\grave{\eta}$ having thus an ac－ tive reference？or（b）＇sure in accord－ ance with the teaching received＇（＇as he hath been taught，＇Auth．Ver．），$\delta \iota \delta a \chi \grave{\eta}$ being taken passively？Of these（b） seems certainly to harmonize best with the normal meaning of $\pi \iota \sigma \tau$ ós；the faith－ ful word is so on account of its accord－ ance with apostolic teaching．Of the other interpretation that noticed by Flatt， 2 （compare Calvin），＇doctrina eru－ diendis hominibus inserviens，＇seems as unduly to press кatà（comp．ver．1）as
that of Raphel（Annot．Vol．II．p．681）， ＇sermo doctrinæ，＇unduly obscures it． $\kappa \alpha\rangle \pi a \rho a \kappa \alpha \lambda \in \hat{i} \nu \kappa . \tau$ ．$\lambda$ ．］＇as well to exhort with the sound doctrine as，＇etc．：on the connection кal－кal，see notes on 1 Tim．iv．10．${ }^{3} \mathrm{E} \nu$ is here instrumental，a construction perfectly natural，especially in cases like the present，when＇the ob－ ject may be conceived as existing in the instrument or means，＇Jelf，Gr．§ 622. 3 ；see Winer，Gr．§48．a，p．346，and notes on 1 Thess．iv．18．On ن́ylaty．$\delta$－ $\delta a \sigma \kappa$ ．see notes on 1 Tim．i． 10 ．
＇่ $\lambda \epsilon \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \gamma \in \iota \nu$ ］＇to confute：＇the words of Chrysostom are definite，$\delta \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ ov̀k єìiòs

 $\lambda u \kappa \hat{v}$ ．The clause leads on to the sub－ ject of ver．10．On toùs à $\nu \tau \iota \lambda$ é $\gamma 0 \nu \tau a s$ （＇gainsayers＇），see notes on ch．ii． 9.

10．$\gamma \alpha{ }^{\prime} \rho$ ］In confirmation，more espe－ cially，of the preceding clause．
$\pi 0 \lambda \lambda 0$ ！кal $\dot{\alpha} \nu v \pi$ ．］＇many uñruly vain－talkers and inward deceivers．＇In his second edition Tisch．has here made two improvements ；he has restored kal with DEFGKL ；al．；Clarom．，Aug．，Vulg．， al．；Chrysost．，Dam．，－its omission be－ ing so obviously referable to an ignorance of the idiomatic moג̀̀s кal（Jelf，Gr．§ 759．4．2）；he has also removed the comma（Lachm．）after àvvi．，as that word is clearly a simple adjective，prefixed to $\mu a \tau \alpha+0 \lambda$ ．and $\phi \rho \in \nu a \pi$ ．，and serving to en－ hance the necessity for $\dot{\epsilon} \pi t \sigma \tau o \mu i \zeta_{\epsilon}(\nu)$ The $\mu a \tau \alpha t o \lambda$ ．（ $\ddot{\pi} \pi$ ．$\lambda \in \gamma$ ó ．，but sec 1 Tim．i．6） and $\phi \rho \in \nu a \pi \alpha ́ \tau a l$（ $\ddot{\alpha} \pi$ ．$\lambda \in \gamma \delta \mu$ ．，but see Gal． vi．3）are the leading substantial words． On фрєvarárทs（＇mentis deceptor，＇Je－ rome，＇making to err the minds of men，＇ Syr．）．which seems to mark the invard－ working，insinuating character of the de－ ceit（＇mentes hominum demulcent et quasi incantant，＇Calvin），see notes on

There are many evil teach－ ere and seducers ；the Cre－ tan character has always been bad，so rebuke and warn them．In the unbe－ lieving and polluted there is neither purity，faith，nor oberlience．

Gal．vi．3，and on＇the case of deccivers and deceived＇generally，Waterl．Serm． xxix．Vol．v．p． 717 sq．
of $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \kappa \pi \in \rho \iota \tau \circ \mu \hat{\eta} s$ ］defines more par－ ticularly the origin of the mischief ；com－ pare ver．14．The deceivers here men－ tioned were obviously not unconverted Jews，but Judaizing Christians，a state of things not unlikely when it is remem－ bered that more than half a century be－ fore this time Jews（perhaps in some numbers）were living in Crete ；sce Jo－ seph．Antiq．xvir．12．1，ib．Bell．Jud． Ir．7．1，and Philo，Leg．ad Caium，§ 36， Vol．11．p． 587 （ed．Mang．）．On the expression oi èk $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \tau$ ．，comp．notes on Gal．iii． 7.
11．oîs $\delta \in \hat{\imath} \kappa . \tau, \lambda$.$] ＇whose mouths$ must be stopped，＇Auth．Ver．；a good idi－ omatic translation，very superior to the Vulg．＇redargui，＇which，though making the reference to $\tau o u s \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau i \lambda$ ．è $\lambda \in$ é $\gamma \chi$ ．，verse 9 ，a little more evident，is not sufficiently
 cither＇（a）＇frenis coercere，＇＇̇ $\pi เ \sigma \tau о \mu t \epsilon i ̂ ~ к а \grave{~}$ E่ $\gamma \chi$ व $\lambda \iota \nu \omega \dot{\sigma} \epsilon \iota$ ，Philo，Leg．Alleg．111．53， Vol．1．p． 117 （ed．Mang．）；compare James iii．3，and the large list of exam－ ples in Loesner，Olserv．p． 425 ；or（b） ＇obturare os，＇Beza，joès ò；nờo ［occludere os］Syriac，Theoph．，－the meaning most suitable in the present case，and perhaps most common；see the examples in Wetstein and Elsner in loc．， the most pertinent of which is perhaps Lucian，Jup．Trag．§ 35，¿̉хヘัv́v $\sigma \in$ ả $\pi 0-$

のic $\tau \nu \in s$ ］＇inasmuch as they；＇explana－ tory force of $\delta \sigma \tau t s$ ，see notes on Galat． iv． 24.
\％$\lambda$ ous к．т．$\lambda$ ．］ ＇overthrow whole houses，＇i．e．＇subvert the faith of whole families，＇the emphasis
resting apparently on the adjective．＇Av－ a $\tau \rho \in ́ \pi \omega$ occurs again 2 Tim．ii．18，but here，from its combination with ǒкous，is a little more specific：examples of $\dot{\alpha} \nu a-$ трéteєlv，the meaning of which however is quite clear，are cited by Kypke，Obs． Vol．II．p．378．The formula is adopted in Conc．Chalced．Can． 23.
\＆$\mu \grave{\eta} \delta \in \hat{i}]$＇things they should not；＇$\mu$＇， not oú（as usually in the N．T．），after the relative ofs ；the class is here only spoken of as conceived to be in existence，though really that existence was not doubtful ； see Winer，Gr．§55．3，p．426．In ref－ erence to the distinction between \＆ou $\delta \in \hat{\imath}$ and $\hat{a} \mu \hat{\jmath} \delta \in \hat{\imath}$ ，Winer refers to the ex－ amples collected by Gayler，Part．Neg． p． 240 ；as，however，that very ill－ar－ ranged list will probably do little for the reader，it may be further said that $A$ ou $\delta \in i ̂$ points to things which are definitely improper or forbidaden，$\hat{4} \mu \hat{\eta} \delta \in \hat{\imath}$ to things which are so，either in the mind of the describer，or which（as here）derive a seeming contingency only from the mode in which the subject is presented．On the use of ou and $\mu \eta$ with relatives，see the brief but perspicuous statement of Herm．on Viger，No．267，and Krüger， Sprachl．§67．4．3．aí $\chi \rho \circ \hat{v}$ $\kappa \epsilon ́ \rho \delta o v s]$＇base gain，＇－marking em－ phatically the utterly corrupt character of these teachers．It was not from fa－ natical motives or a morbid and Plarisa－ ical（Matth．xxiii．15）love of proselytiz－ ing，but simply for selfish objects and dirty gains．The words may also very probably have had reference to the gene－ ral Cretan character ；the remark of Po－ lybius is very noticeable ；кavó入ou $\delta^{\circ} \delta$

 $\tau \epsilon \pi \alpha \rho \alpha ̀ ~ \mu o ́ \nu o l s ~ K \rho \eta \tau \tau a t \epsilon \hat{v} \sigma \iota \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha ́ \nu \tau \tau \omega \nu$



 סos, Hist. vi. 46.3 : see Meursius, Creta, vi. 10, p. 231.
12. $\bar{\epsilon} \xi a \dot{u} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ can only refer to those whom the apostle is about to mention by name,-the Cretans; $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ K $\rho \eta \tau \bar{\omega} \nu \bar{\nu} \iota \epsilon-$
 ret. To refer the pronoun to the preceding oi èк $\pi \in \rho \iota \tau$., or $\pi$ толлоl $\kappa$. т. $\lambda$. (as apparently Matth.), would involve the assumption that the Cretan Jews had assimilated all the peculiar evil elements of the native Cretan (see De Wette), a somewhat unneeessary hypothesis. The Cretans deserved the censure, not as being themselves false teachers, but as readily giving ear to such.
 There is here no redundancy; ait $\bar{\omega} \nu$ states that he belonged to them, Yồos marks the antithesis ; he was a prophet of their own, not one of another country,
 Winer, Gr.§ 22. 7, p. 139. The prophet here alluded to is not Callimachus (Theod.), but Epimenides (Chrys., al.), a a Cretan, born at Cnossus or Gortyna, said to have been priest, bard, and seer among his countrymen, to have visited Athens about 596 B. C.. and to have died soon afterwards above 150 years old. He appears to have deserved the title $\pi \rho o \phi$. in its fullest sense, heing termed a งิcios àvip, Plato, Legg. 1. p. 642, and coupled with Bacis and the Erythrean Sibyl by Cicero, de Div. 1. 18. The verse in question is referred by Jerome to the work of
 tails see Fabricius, Bibl. Greeca, I. 6, Vol. 1. p. 36 (ed. 1708), and Heinrich, Epinenides (Leips. 1801 ).
$\dot{\alpha} \in\{\psi \in \hat{v} \sigma \tau \alpha t]$ 'always liars.' Repeated again by Callimachus, Hymn. ad Jov. 8 , and if antiquity can be trusted, a char-
acter only too well deserved: hence the
 Polyb. Hist. viri. 21. 5, see also ib. vr. 48. 5, Ovid, Art. Am. I. 298 : compare Winer, $R$ WB. s. v. 'Kreta,' Vol. f. p. 676, Meursius, Creta, iv. 10. p. 223. Coray regards this despicable vice as perhaps a bequest which they received from their early Pheenician colonists; cermpare Heeren, Histor. Researches, Vol. 11. p. 28 (Translation).
$\kappa \alpha \kappa \grave{\alpha}$ a $\eta$ p $\left\{a_{1}^{2}\right.$ ' $e v i l$ beasts,' in referenco to their wild and untamed nature (comp.
 in reference to Archelaus, and the examples in Wetst. and Kypke), and possibly, though not so pertinently, to their aio$\chi$ фокќро́єla and utter worthlessness, Polyb. Hist. vi. 46. 3. They formed the first of the three bad «d́maa's (Крŋ̄тєs,
 and appy. deserved their position.
raotépes àpral] 'idle bellies,' i.e. 'do-nothing gluttons,' Peile, comp. Phil. iii. 19 ; in reference to their slothful sensuality, their dull gluttony and licentiousness ; 'gulæ et inerti otio deditæ,' Est. The Cretan character which transpires in Plato, Legg. Book r., in many points confirms this charge, especially in respect of sensuality. Further examples of ápyds in the fem. form, nearly all from late writers, are given by Lobeck, Phryn. p. 105.
13. $\dot{\eta} \mu a \rho \tau v \rho\left\{a \quad \kappa . \tau_{0} \lambda_{\text {. }}\right.$ ] This testimony is true.' It is very hasty in De Wette to find in this expression anything harsh or uncharitable. The nature of the people the apostle knew to be what Epimenides had declared it ; their tendencies were to evil ('dubium non est, quin deterrimi fuerint,' Calv.), and for the sake of truth, holiness, and the Gospel, the remedy was to be firmly applied:



see some wise thoughts of Waterland on this subject, Doct. of Trin. ch. 4. Vol. III. p. 460 sq.
$\delta i^{3} \boldsymbol{\eta} \nu a i \tau\{a \nu\}$ ' for which cause,' on account of these na-

 Chrys. Compure notes on 2 Tim. i. 12. $\epsilon \lambda \in \gamma \chi \in \kappa . \tau . \lambda$.] 'confute them, set them right, with severity;' not the deceivers so much as the deceived, who also by their ready acquiescence in the false teaching ( $8 \lambda$ ous ǒkous, ver. 11) might tend to propagate the error. The adverb àmotópws ( $\sigma \kappa \lambda \eta \rho \bar{\omega} s$, à $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \iota \tau \eta$ خ̀cos, Hesych.) only occurs again in 2 Cor. xiii. 10, (àmoto$\mu(a$, Rom. xi. 22 , in opposition to $\chi \rho \eta \sigma-$ $\tau \sigma \tau \eta s)$ and, as the derivation suggests, marks the asperity ('asperum et abscissum castigationis genus,' Valer. Max. iI. 7. 14) of the rebuke: in Dion. Hal. viri. 61, the substantive stands in opp. to тঠ̀ ėmteıкés, and in Diod. Sic. xxxiri. frag. 1, to $\grave{\eta} \mu \in \rho$ óт $\eta s$. See further examples in Wetstein, Vol. II. p. 75 , and especially Kypke, Obs. Vol. II. p. 179, compared with Fritz. Rom. Vol. 11. p. 508. \% $\%$ к. $\boldsymbol{\tau}$. $\lambda$.] 'in order thut they may be sound in the fuith ;' object and intent of the recommended course of action. De Wette here modifies the meaning of lya as if it were used to specify the substance of the reproof: such an interpretation is grammatically adt'missible (Winer, Gr. § 44. 8, see notes on Eph. i. 17), but in the present case not necessary; the Cretan disciples were doctrinally sick (עoбoûvtes, 1 Tim. vi. 4); the object of the sharp reproof was to restore them to health; compare Theodoret. The sphere and element in which that doctrinal health was to be enjoyed was $\pi i \sigma \tau \iota s$.
14. $\mu$ خ̀ $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \epsilon \in \chi \circ y \tau \in S$ ] 'not giving heend to;' see notes on 1 Tim. i. 4 ; and
on the $\mu \hat{\nu} \uparrow \begin{gathered}\text { ol, here specially characterized }\end{gathered}$ as 'Iovoaïкol, see also notes on the same verse, whore the nature of the errors condemned by these Epistles is luriefly stated. $\hat{\epsilon} \nu \tau 0 \lambda a \hat{\iota} s \dot{\alpha} \nu \hat{\nu} \rho$.] 'commandinents of men' (compare Matth. xv. 9, Col. ii. 22), in antithesis to the commandments of God (Wiesinger), though this antithesis, owing to the necessarily close connection of $\alpha, \nu \uparrow \rho \omega \dot{\sigma} \pi \omega \nu$ and the tertiary predicate $\dot{\alpha} \pi о \sigma т \rho \in ф о \mu$ é$\nu \omega \nu$, must not be too strongly pressed: compare the following note. The context seems clearly to show that these $\bar{\epsilon} \nu$ to入ai were of a ceremonial character, and involved ascetical restrictions, $\tau \grave{s} s \pi \alpha \rho \alpha-$ т $\eta \rho \eta \eta_{\sigma}$ Is $\tau \bar{\omega} \nu$ ßp $\omega \mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu$, Theophyl. They had, moreover, an essentially bad origin,
 vacia $\sigma \omega \mu a \tau \iota \kappa$, based not on the old ceremonial law, but on the rules of a much more recent asceticism, formed the background of all these commandments.
$\dot{\alpha} \pi \rho \sigma \tau \rho \in \phi \circ \mu . \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \eta_{1}$.] 'turning aside from the truth,' sc. 'turning aside as they do,' - not (if we adopt the strictest rules of translation) 'who are turning away,' etc. Alf. ; see Donalds. Gr. § 492, and compare notes to Transl. On àmooт $\rho$ '́ $\phi$., compare notes on 2 Tim. i. 15, and on the absence of the article before àmo$\sigma \tau \rho \in \phi \circ \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \omega \nu$, Winer, Gr. §20.4, p. 126. If the article had been prefixed to the two substantives, and to the participle, then the two thoughts, that they were ordinances of men, and that these men were also yery bad men, would have been made more prominent; compare notes on Gal. iii. 26 : if the article had been only befure the part., then the $\alpha_{\nu} \nu$ N $\rho \omega \pi o l$ would be considered an undefined class, which it was the object of the participial clause more nearly to specify; see notes on 1 Tim. iii. 13.




15. $\pi \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \alpha]$ 'all things,'- not merely in reference to any ' ciborum discrimen,' Calv., but with a greater comprehensiveness (comp. oùdè below), iueluding everything to which the distinction of pure and impure could be applied. Here, however, Chrysostom seems unduly in-
 $\mu \grave{\eta}$ à $\mu a p t i \alpha, ~ \mu o ́ v \eta ; ~ t h e ~ s t a t e m e n t ~ m u s t ~ n e-~-~$ cessarily be confined to such things and such objects as can be the materials and, as it were, the substrata for actions (De Wette) ; comp. Rom. xiv. 20. The insertion of $\mu \grave{\iota} \nu$ after $\pi a ́ v \tau a$ is rightly rejected by Tischend. and Lachmann, with ACD'ELFG, al.; being so very probably occasioned by the following $\delta$ é. Winer (Gr. §61. 4, p. 493 sq.) urges its juxtaposition to a word with which it is not naturally connected (Acts xxii. 3, 1 Cor. ii. 15) as a reason why it was struck out ; this is plausible, the uncial authority, however, seems too decided to admit of this defence. $\tau 0$ is $\kappa \alpha \hat{\alpha} \alpha \rho \circ \hat{\imath} s]$ 'for the pure,' scil., 'for them to make use of ;' dat. commodi, not dat. judicii, 'in the estimation of,' which, though admissible in this clause (see examples in Scheuerl. Synt. § 21. 5, p. 163, Winer, Gr. § 31. 4, p. 190), would not be equaliy so in the second; the $\mu \in \mu$ ra $\mu$ $\mu$ évot and ámıเбтot do not merely account all things as impure ( $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha ̀ ~ \tau \eta े \nu ~ \mu \epsilon \mu \mu \alpha \sigma \mu$.
 convert them into such ; 'pro qualitate vescentium et mundum mundis et immundum contaminatis fit,' Jerome. Their own inward impurity is communicated to all external things; the objects with which they come in contact become materials of $\sin$; compare De Wette in loc.
à $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ [ $\sigma \tau 0 \iota s$ ] 'unbelieving;'
a frightful addition to the preceding $\mu \mathrm{\epsilon}-$
$\mu$ ца $\mu$ évoos. Not only are they deficient in all moral purity, but destitute of all $\pi i \sigma \tau \iota s$. The former epithet stands in more exact antithesis to кavapois, while the latter heightens the picture. Practical unbelief (ver. 16) is only too commonly allied with moral pollution. On
 KL; al.), compare Lobeck, Phryn. p. 35. д̀л $\lambda \grave{\alpha} \mu \epsilon \mu\{a \nu \tau \alpha ؛$ к. $\tau . \lambda$.] 'but both their mind and their conscience have been polluted; ' declaration on the positive side of what has just been expressed on the neyative, and indirect confirmation of it. It need searcely be observed that $\dot{\lambda} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha}$, is by no means equivalent to $\gamma$ d́p; the latter would give a reason why nothing was pure to the polluted ; the former states with full adversative force the fact of an internal pollution, which makes the former statement, 'that nothing external was pure to them,' feeble when contrasted with it ; see especially Klotz, Devar. Vol. yı. p. 9. On the more emphatic enumeration kal-каi, see notes on 1 Tim. iv. 10, and Donalds. Gr. § 550 sq . Noûs is here not merely the 'mens speculativa' (comp. Sanderson, de Obl. Consc. § 17, Vol. Iv. p. 13, ed. Jacobs.), but the willing as well as the thinking part of man (Delitzsch, Psychol. iv. 5, p. 140, Beck, Bibl. Seelenl. II. 18. b, p. 54); see also the notes on 1 Tim. vi. 5. Eivei $\delta \eta \eta \sigma$ is is the conscience, the moral consciousness within (see esp. notes on 1 Timothy i. 5); the two united thus represent, in the language of Beck, the 'Lebenstrom in seinem Aus- und Einfluss zusammen,' p. 49, note. Bp. Taylor (Ductor Dub. 1. 1. 1. 7), somewhat infelicitously regards the two terms as identical.
16. $\delta \mu \circ \lambda o \gamma o \nu ิ \sigma \iota \nu$ ] 'they profess;'

Charge the aged men to be sober and faithful; the aged women to be holy themselves and to school the younger women.
 ка入ią ${ }^{2} \pi \rho \epsilon \sigma \beta$ útas $\nu \eta \phi a \lambda i ́ o u s ~ \epsilon i ̂ v a l, ~ \sigma є \mu \nu о u ́ s, ~$

they make an open confession of God, but practically deny it, being deficient in all true eamestness; 'quotiescumque vincimur vitiis atque peccatis, toties Dcum neganus,' Jerome.
ג̀ $\rho \nu 0 \bar{\nu} \nu \tau \alpha$ a ] 'deny (Him);' in opposition to of ood. The Vulg. (perhaps) and a few commentators (Wiesing., al.) supply eióéval after àpyoùvral. This does not seem necessary ; the use of àpveio Nat with an accus. personce is so extremely common, that it is best, with Syr., to retain the simpler construction. Though so common in the N. Test., àppê̂oval is only used by St. Paul in the Past. Eppp; ; add Heb. xi. 24.
$\beta \delta \in \lambda \cup \kappa$ -
то亿] 'abominable;' äm, $\lambda \in \gamma \delta \mu$. in N.T.;
 $\beta \delta є \lambda u \kappa \tau o ́ s$ (
 oblique reference to idolatry ( $\beta \delta \in \in$ ć $\mathbf{\gamma} \mu \alpha-$ $\tau \alpha$, Deut. xxix. 17, al.), nor necessarily to the abomination in which certain animals, etc., were formerly held (Lev. xi. 10), and which they might have still maintained, though this is more plausible ; compare Wiesing. It is simply said that their actions and principles made them 'abominable' ( $\mu \iota \boldsymbol{\sigma}$ тoí, Hesych.) in the sight of God. The verb is used metaphorically in Attic writers, but not in a sense so far removed from the primary notion of ( $\beta \overline{0} \epsilon \omega)$ as in the LXX. and eccl. writers ; compare Aristophan. $V_{\text {esp. }} 792$.

д̀ $\delta \delta \kappa \iota \mu \circ \iota]$ 'reprobate;' not actively 'qui bonum probare non possunt,' Bengel, but passively, 'reprobi,' Vulg., Clarom., Goth. ('uskusaniii,' - cogn. with 'choose '), as in 2 Tim. iii. 8 and elsewhere in the N. T. ; see notes in loc. The use of the word, if we except Heb. vi. 8 , is confined to St. Paul.

Chapter II. 1. $\sigma \grave{\text { ì }} \delta$ б́ $]$ ' But do thou,' address to Titus in contrast to these false teachers ; so 2 Tim. iii. 10, iv. 5. Chrysostom las here missed the force of

 compare also Theodoret; Titus is not tacitly warned not to be deterred or disheartened, but is exhorted to preach sound doctrine in opposition to their errors. $\lambda \alpha ́ \lambda \in t]$ 'speak,' 'utter;' 'ore non cohibito,' Bengel. On the difference between $\lambda a \lambda e i v$, ' vocem ore mittere' [ $\lambda a \lambda$-, Germ. lallen, comp. Benfey, Wurzellex. Vol. in. p. 9], तé $\gamma \in 1 \nu$, ' dicere, sc. colligere verba in sententiam ' (comp. Donalds. Cratyl. $\S 453$ ), and eimeîv, 'verba facere,' see Tittmann, Synon. 1. p. 80
 sound doctrine;' see notes on 1 Tim. i. 10.
2. $\pi \rho \in \sigma \beta \dot{v} \tau \alpha s$ ] 'aged men,' 'senes,' Vulg., Clarom. ; not $\pi \rho \in \sigma \beta u \tau \in \in \rho o u s$, in an official sense: ' in duas classes $\nu \epsilon \omega \tau \tau^{\prime} \rho \omega \nu$ et $\pi \rho \in \sigma \beta u \tau^{\prime} \rho \rho \omega \nu$ dividunt apostoli populum Christianum in unaquâque Ecclcsia,' Pearson, Vind. Ign. (ad Lect.), p. 12 (A.-C. Libr.). The infinitive with the accusative specifies the substance of the order which was contained in what Titus was to enunciate : comp. Madvig, Synt. § $146 . \quad \nu \eta \phi a \lambda$ [ous] 'sober;', Vulg., Clarom., - not 'watcliful,' Syriac $-\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{x}^{\text {n }}$ [excitati], and even Chrys.; see notes on 1 Tim. iii. 2, and on 2 Tim. iv. 5. On the meaning of $\sigma \epsilon \mu \nu \delta \delta$ s, compare notes on 1 Tim. ii. 2, and on that of $\sigma \dot{\omega} \phi \rho \omega \nu$, ib. ii. 9.
T? $\pi i \sigma \tau \in \iota$ ] 'in respect of faith;' dative ' of reference to,' see notes on Gal. i. 22, and Winer, Gr. § 31. 6, p. 193. It may be observed that this expression may almost be interchanged with eiv and tho

#   

4. $\sigma \omega \phi p o \nu i\} \omega \sigma \iota \nu]$ So Rec. with CDEKL; al. (Griesb., De Wette, Huther, al.). Both Tisch. and Lachm. read $\sigma \omega \phi \rho o \nu i\{o v \sigma \iota \nu$ with AFGH; al. This does not seem sufficient evidence for a solecism so very glaring, especially when in the very next verse $7_{v a}$ is used again and correctly. In 1 Cor, iv, 6, Gal. iv. 17, this may be more easily accounted for; see notes on Gal. l. c., and compare Winer, G'r. § 41. 1, p. 259.
dat. as in ch. i. 13 : this seems to confirm the remark in Gal. l.c., that these sorts of datives may not uncommonly be considered as species of the local dative ethically used. Here the $\tau \delta$ viraivety of the aged men was to be shown in their faith ; it was to the province of that virtue that the exhibition of it was to be limited.
$\hat{v} \pi \circ \mu \circ \nu \hat{\eta}]$ 'patience;' 'in ratione bene consideratâ stabilis et perpetua mansio,' Cicero, de Invent. 11. 54. It is here joined with $\pi i \sigma \tau \iota s$ and $\alpha \alpha^{\prime} \alpha{ }^{\prime} \pi \eta$, as in 1 Tim. vi. 11 (comp. 1 Thess. i. 3), and serves to mark the brave patience, the enduring fortitude, which marks the true Christian character ; see notes on 2 Tim. ii. 10, and comp. Usteri, Lehrb. II. 1. 4, p. 240.
5. $\pi \rho \in \sigma \beta$ र́ $\tau \iota \delta \alpha s]$ 'aged women;' synonymous with the $\pi \rho \in \sigma \beta \dot{v} \tau \in \rho \alpha, 1$ Tim. v. 2. On ש́auitcos, compare notes on 1 Tim. iii. 8 ; the aged women were not to be $\omega$ s $\dot{\epsilon} \tau \in \dot{\epsilon} \rho \omega s$ in respect of any of the foregoing qualifications.
e่v катабтท́naть 'in demeanor,'
 meaning a little, but a little only, different from катaбто入h, 1 Tim. ii. 9. In the latter text the prevailing idea is perhaps outward deportment as enhanced by what is purely external, dress, etc., in the present case outward deportment as dependent on something more internal, e. g. manner, gesture, etc., 'incessus et motus, vultus, sermo, silentium,' Jerome ; see also Coray in loc. It is manifestly contrary to the true meaning of the word to refer it to the mere externals of dress
on the one hand ( $\tau \dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon \rho ı \beta o \lambda \alpha i \alpha$, Ccum.), and it seems inexact, without more precise adjuncts in the context, to limit it solely to internals ('ornatus virtutum,' Beng.) on the other. Wetst. cites Porphyr. de Abst. Iv. 6, $\tau \delta \delta$ ̀̀ $\sigma \epsilon \mu \nu \grave{\nu} \nu \kappa a ̀ k ~ \tau o \hat{v}$

 $\mu \in \gamma a ́ \lambda \eta \mu a i \eta r \epsilon i ́ a$. Plutarch uses somewhat similarly the curious adjective, $\kappa \alpha-$ табтךuaтıкós, e. g. Tib. Gracch. § 2, ióéa
 $\pi \rho \bar{i} o s ~ \kappa a l ~ \kappa a \tau \alpha \sigma \tau$ : गु $\nu$. On the most suitable translation, see notes in loc.
$i \in \rho \circ \pi \rho \in \pi \in i s\rceil$ 'holy-beseeming,' 'as becometh holiness,' Auth. Ver. ; the best gloss is the parallel passage, 1 Tim. ii.

 $\pi \in l$ a $\gamma$ lots. The word is an $\ddot{\alpha}^{\prime} \pi$. $\lambda \in \gamma \delta \mu$. in the N. T., but not very uncommon elsewhere, e. g. Xenoph. Sympos. viri. 40, Plato, Thicages, p. 122 D : see these and other examples in Wetst. On $\beta$ a $a \beta$ obious, see notes on 1 T'im. iii. 11 .
$\mu$ ो̀ ot $\omega$ к. т. $\lambda$.) 'not enslaved to much wine;' an expression a little stronger than 1 Tim. iii. 8, $\mu \eta)^{\%} \nu \omega \varphi$ по $\lambda \lambda \hat{\varphi}$ тробє́$\chi$ रovess, and possibly due to the greater prevalence of that vice in Creto: this transpires clearly enough in Plato, Legg. I. and II, comp. Book 1. § 11, p. 641. $\kappa a \lambda \circ \delta \iota \delta \alpha \sigma \kappa a \lambda \circ v s$ ] 'teachers of what is good ;' 'honestatis magistræ,' Beza, not by public teaching, but, as the context implies by its specifications, in domestic privacy, $\mathrm{E}^{\prime} \mathrm{m}^{\prime}$ oikias, Chrysost. On кaлds compare notes on 1 Tim. iv. 4.



6. $\% \nu \alpha \sigma \omega \phi \rho \circ \nu\left\{\zeta \omega \sigma \iota \nu \quad \kappa_{0} \tau_{0} \lambda_{0}\right]$ ' that they may school the young women to be, etc. ; ' $\pi \alpha \iota \delta \in \dot{\omega} \omega \sigma \iota \nu$, Theoph., - not exactly 'prudentiam doceant,' Vulg., Claroman. (comp. Syr.), which, though perfectly correct per se, would here, on account of the following $\sigma \omega \phi p o v a s$, be somewhat tautologous: numerous examples of this special sense of $\sigma \omega \phi \rho$, are cited by Loesn. Obs. p. 427, from Philo, all apparently confirmed by its connection with, and juxtaposition to, the weaker $\nu 0 u \uparrow \uparrow \epsilon \tau \in i v$. It may be remarked that in the corresponding passage, 1 Tim. v. 2, Timothy is himself directed to exhort the $\nu \in \omega \tau$ t' $\rho a s$, here it is to be done by others: this was probably in consequence of the greater amount of practical teaching and exhortation which the Cretan women required. It does not seem necessary with Tisch. to advocate a solecistic reading when the correct mood is fairly supported; see crit. note.
$\phi \iota \lambda \alpha \nu \delta \rho o v s]$ 'lovers of their husbands;' тঠ кєфá入aıo тоûтo тต̂ע катณ̀ $\tau \grave{\nu} \nu$ oikiav ảyantî̀, Chrys. This and the adjectives which follow, are, as tival further suggests, dependent on the verb immediately preceding, and serve more specifically to define the nature and substance of the $\sigma \omega \phi \rho о \nu / \sigma \mu \sigma^{\prime}$. If the connection had been with $\lambda \alpha{ }_{\alpha} \lambda \epsilon$ as in ver. 3 , the infinitive, as there, would more naturally have been omitted. Calvin evades this objection by referring $\phi เ \lambda \alpha{ }^{2} \delta \rho$. and $\phi เ \lambda о \tau \epsilon \in \kappa \nu$, to the $\nu \in ́ a i$, but $\sigma \omega ́ \phi p o v a s ~ \kappa . \tau . \lambda$., to the $\pi \rho \in \sigma \beta \dot{\tau} \tau \iota \delta \epsilon s:$ this, however, wholly mars the natural sequence of epithets. The véal are here, as the immediate context shows, primarily the young married women, but of course not exclusively, as four out of these epithets can belong equally to married or single ; comp. notes on ver. 6.
7. $\sigma \omega \phi \rho o \nu a s]$ 'sober-minded,' 'dis-
crect;' sec notes on 1 Tim. ii. 9. The more general is then followed by the more special áyvás, which here, as the subject and the context seem to require, has reference, not to a purity from $\pi \nu \in \nu$ $\mu a \tau \iota \kappa \delta{ }_{s} \mu 0 \lambda v \sigma \mu \delta_{s}$ (Coray), but more particularly to 'chastity;' каl $\sigma \omega ́ \mu a t \iota ~ к а l ~$
 кai $\mu$ i $\xi \in \omega s$ кal '̇ $\pi \iota ง v \mu i ́ a s$, Theophyl. oikovpoús] 'Ieepers at home,' Auth. Ver., 'domisedas,' 'casarias,' Elsner ; more literally, Clarom. 'domum custodientes,' similarly Vulg., Syr., 'domus curam habentes.' According to Hesych.
 $\phi \cup \lambda a ́ \tau \tau \omega \nu$, the Homeric oúpos, 'watcher' [possibly from op- 'watch' (?), Pott, Etym. Forsch. Vol. I. p. 123, compare фpoupá], giving the compound its definite meaning : sce Suicer, Thesaur. s. v., and the large collection of examples in Elsner, Obs. Vol. II. p. 324 sq. The reading oikoupyoús (Lachm.), though well supported $\left[A C D^{1} F G\right]$, and now adopted by Tisch. (ed. 7), must still be considered doubtful, as no other example of its use has as yet been adduced; the verb occurs Clem. Rom. I. 1, and apparently in reference to this passage. It has also been found in Soranus (A. D. 120 ?), de Arte Obst. vili. 21, but its association with kavédpto makes the reading very doubtful. If it be adopted here, the meaning will be 'workers at home,' and the exhortation practically the same; there is to be no $\pi \epsilon \rho เ \epsilon ́ \rho \chi \in \sigma \uparrow$ al, 1 Tim. v. 13 ; home occupations are to preclude it.
$\dot{\alpha} \gamma a \mathfrak{a} \alpha{ }^{\circ}$ is not to be joined with oiкӧupoús, as apparently Syr. and Theophyl., but regarded as an independent epithet $=$ 'benignas,' Vulg., Arm., al. ; compare Matth. xx. 15. On the distinction between ả ${ }^{2}$ asds ('qui commodum aliis prostat') and סíkalos ('qui resti et ho.

Fxhort young men to be sober, being thyself a pattern ; exhort servants both to please their masters and to be trusty.
 фроעєі̂v, ${ }^{7}$ тєрі̀ тávта бєаутòv тарєХо́ $\mu \in \nu$ оs

nestí legem sequitur'), see Tittm. Synon. 1. p. 19 sq.; compare notes on Gal. v. 22. The interpretation of Bloomficld, 'good managers,' according to which it is to be considered as 'exegetical of the preceding,' is wholly untenable. It is rather added with a gentle contrast ; the nikoupia was not to be marred by 'austeritas,' sc. 'in servulos' (Jerome), or by improper thrift (Heydenr.).
íлотаббо $\mu$ '́ $\nu$ as к. $\left.\tau . \lambda_{0}\right]$ 'submitting themselves to their own husbands.' On the distinction between úmotá $\sigma \sigma$. (sponte) and $\pi \in เ \grave{\text { ápкєєiv (coactus), see Tittmann, Synon. }}$ Part II. p. 3, and on the proper force of the pronominal rotos (Donalds. Cratyl. § 139) when thus connected with d. $\nu \eta$ ip, see notes on Ephes. v. 22. The concluding words of the verse, $Z_{\nu \alpha} \mu \eta$ к. $\tau . \lambda$., are most naturally connected with this last clause (Est.) : the $\lambda$ b́yos тoû ©єoû (the Gospel) would be evil spoken of if it were practically apparent that Christian wives did not duly obey their husbands ; compare 1 Tim. vi. 1. Theodoret refers it, somerwhat too narrowly, to the fact of women leaving their husbands
 mand bere, and the expressed command, Ephes. $\mathbf{\nabla}$. 22, are perfectly general and inclusive.
6. $\nu \in \omega \tau$ є́ $\rho o u s$ ] 'the younger men,' in contrast with the $\pi \rho \in \sigma \beta$ v́tas, ver. 1 ; just as the $\nu$ éal form a contrasted class to the т $\rho \in \sigma$ ßútiôes. There is thus no gooũ reason for extending it, with Matth., to the young of both sexes. It seems to have been the apostle's desire that the exhortations to the Cretan véal should be specially administered by those of their own sex; contrast 1 Tim. v. 2.
$\sigma \omega \phi \rho \circ \nu \in \hat{\imath} \nu]$ 'to be sober-minded;' in this pregnant word a young man's duty is simply but comprehensively enunciat-


 compare Neand. Planting, Vol. r. p. 486 (Bohn). The repeated occurence of this word in different forms in the last few verses, would seem to hint that 'immoderati affectus' were sadly prevalent in Crete, and that the apostle had the best of reasons for that statement in i..13, which De W. and others so improperly and unreasonably presume to censure.
7. $\pi \in \rho\} \pi \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \alpha$ is not to be connected with $\sigma \omega \phi \rho o \nu \in i v($ ' ut pudici sint in omnibus,' Jerome), but, as ŚSyr., Vulgate, Chrys., and in fact all the leading versions and expositors, with $\sigma \in a u \tau$. тape$\chi \dot{\mu} \mu \in \nu o s$. It can scarcely be necessary to add that $\pi \alpha{ }^{2} \nu \tau \alpha$ is neuter ; for the uses of $\pi \in \rho \mathfrak{\ell}$, sce notes on 1 : Tim. i. 19.
$\sigma \in \alpha v \tau \delta \nu \pi a \rho \in \chi]$ 'exlibiting thyself;' reflexive pronoun with the middle voice; see Winer, Gr. § 38.6, p. 230. In this use, not without precedent in earlier Greek, e. g. Xenophon, Cyrop. viri. 1. 39, Plato, Legg. x. p. 890 c, emphasis and perspicuity are gained by the special addition of the pronoun. Here, for instance, without the pronoun the reference might have seemed doubtful; the túrov might have been referred to one of the $\nu \epsilon \omega \dot{\tau} \epsilon \rho \frac{t}{}$ and the use of the middle to the interest felt by Titus in making lim so. In such eases care must be taken to discriminate between what is now termed an intensive or ' dynamic' middle (Kírüger, compare notes on 1 Tim. iv. 6) and a simple reflexive middle : in the former case the pronoun would seem generally admissible, in the latter (the present case), it can only legitimately appear, when emphasis or precision cannot be secured without it ; see Krüger, Sprachl: §52.10. 10, and on the uses of $\pi$ apéx.

## 

compare Kuster，de Verb．Med．§ 49. $\kappa \alpha \lambda \hat{\omega} \nu$ ビe $\rho$ ．］On this expression，which is perfectly comprehensive and inclusive， compare notes on ch．iii．8．Few will be disposed to agree with Calvin in his con－ nection of these words with $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau \hat{\eta} \delta \iota \delta \alpha \sigma-$ калía．ג̇ф ruptness，＇＇sincerity，＇scil．таре $\delta$ buevos； ＇integritatem，＇Vulg．，Clarom．：Syriac paraphrases．The associated word $\sigma \epsilon \mu$－ vórns as well as what would otherwise
 refer à $\downarrow$ sopiáa，not objectively to the
 Coray），but subjectively to the teacher， compare 2 Cor．xi． 3 ；in his סঠóoara入ía he was to be äфsopos（Artemid．v．95）， in his delivery of it $\sigma \epsilon \mu \nu \delta \delta$ ：a chaste sin－ cerity of mind was to be combined with a dignified $\sigma \epsilon \mu \nu \dot{\partial} \tau \eta s$ of manner．This connection is rendered perlaps still more probable by the reading of the text（Lach－ mann，Tisch．）：of two similarly abstract subst．，it would seem hardly natural to refer one to the teaching and the other to the teacher．The addition à $\phi$ aqpoíav （Rec．，but not Rec．of Elz．）is not well supported，viz，only by $\mathrm{D}^{3} \mathrm{E}\left[{ }^{2}\right.$ ？$] \mathrm{KL}$ ； about 30 mss．；and a few $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$ ．The va－ riety of reading in this passage is con－ siderable，see Tisch．in loc．On $\sigma \epsilon \mu \nu \dot{\partial}$ íns see notes on 1 Tim．ii．2，and on the prac－ tical applications of the verse， Bp ．Tay－ lor，Serm．x．xi．
8．$\lambda$ ó $\gamma o \nu$ v $\hat{\gamma}$ เท̂］＇sound discourse，＇ not merely in private life（＇in consuetu－ dine quotidianâ，＇Beng．），but，as the con－ text seems to require，in the exercise of his public duties，more especially in preaching，compare I Tim．v．17：＇inter docendum nihil aliud loquere quam quod sauæ fidei conveniat，＇Estius．Several examples of this use of $\begin{gathered}\text { yhins are cited by }\end{gathered}$ Raphael，Annot．，Vol．II．p．636．The $\lambda$ doos is moreover not only to be intrin－ sieally $\dot{\text { équths}}$ ，but so carefully considered and expressed as to be d̀kađd́yvootos，
open to neither contempt nor animadver－ sion；＇＇nihil dignum reprehensione dicat aut faciat，licet adversarii sint ad repre－ hendum parati，＇Jerome：comp． 1 Tim． vi． 14.
$\delta \in \xi \in \nu a \nu \tau\{a s$, sc．$\chi$ ఢ́pas（Bos，Ellips．p． 562 （325），ed． Schref．），if indleed it be thought necessa－ ry to supply the ellipsis at all．The ref－ erence is doubtful）；the＇adversary＇（＇he who riseth against us，＇Syr．）scems cer－ tainly not $\delta$ óráßoxos（Chrys．），but rather
 opposing false teacher，or the gainsaying heathen．On the whole，the allusion in ver． 5 ，compared with the nearly certain reading $\eta_{\mu} \mu \bar{\omega} \nu$（us Christians），makes the latter reference（to the heathen）the most plausible ；compare 1 Tim．v．14．The statement of Matth．that $\triangle$ CDEFG read $\hat{\nu}_{\mu} \mu \nu$ is completely erroneous；all the above，with the exception of A，read ท̄ $\mu \omega \bar{\nu}$ ；sce Tisch．in loc．
दे $\nu \tau \rho a \pi \hat{n}]$＇may be shamed，＇－not mid－ dle＇sich schäme，＇Huther，but appar－ ently here with a purely passive sense comp．Syr．Lỡ $\mathfrak{A}$ ，＇pudefiat，＇，＇eru－ bescat＇），as in 2 Thess．iii． 14 ；compare 1 Cor．iv．14，Psalm xxxiv．26，aiఠxuy．

$\phi a \hat{v} \lambda o \nu]$＇bad，＇$\hat{\text { ño }}$［odiosum］Syr．； John iii．20，v． 29 （in opp．to áyaids）， James iii．16；Rom．ix．11， 2 Cor．v． 10，are both doubtful．This adjective， in its primary meaning＇light，＇＇blown about by every wind＇（Donalds．Cratyl． § 152 ），is used with a distinct moral ref－ erence in earlier as well as later writers （see examples in Rost u．Palm，Lex． s．v．）；in the latter，however，it is used in more frequent antithesis to $\dot{\alpha} \gamma a \underset{\text { o }}{6}$ s，and comes to mean little less than kakds （Thom．M．p．889，ed．Bern．）or $\pi$ тovn－ pós；comp．Fritz．Rom．Vol．II．p． 297.
 servants to be in subjection to their own



 $\pi a ̂ \sigma \iota \nu$.
10. $\pi a ̂ \sigma a \nu \pi i ́ \sigma \tau \iota \nu] ~ S o ~ L a c h m . ~ w i t h ~ A C D E ; ~ a l .5 ; ~ C l a r o m ., ~ S a n g e r m ., ~ a l . ~ ; ~ L a t . ~$ Ff. The order is reversed by Tisch. with ILL ; great majority of mss. ; Copt., al. ; Chrys., Theod., Dam., al. (Rec., Griesh., Scholz), but the weight of uncial authority seems certainly in favor of the reading of the text. It may be also remarked that apparently in every other instance in St. Paul's Epistles (except Eph. iv. 19) where $\pi \hat{\alpha} s$ is in connection with an abstract and anarthrous substantive, it does not follow but precedes the noun.
masters.' It does not seem necessary to refer this construction to ver. 1 Matth.) ; the infin. is dependent on таракá $\lambda \epsilon \iota$, ver. 6 , the two following verses being dependent on the participle $\pi \alpha \rho \in \chi$. and practically parenthetical. On the general drift of these exhortations to slaves, and on the meaning of some particular terms (ióios, $\delta \in \sigma \pi$ ótals), see notes and references on 1 Tim. vi. 1 seq. The deportment and relations to the оiкобє́бтотаь of women and servants were practically to teach and edify the heathen; ou $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ àm סó $\gamma \mu \alpha \tau о s ~ \delta б ́ \gamma \mu a \tau \alpha$ à $\lambda \lambda$ ’ à $\pi \delta$ т $\pi \alpha ́ \gamma \mu a \tau \omega \nu$
 Chrysost., - who, however; in an interesting passage, speaks very despondingly of the moral and religious opportunities of ถoûגot. ध ध $\alpha \rho$ é $\sigma \tau$ ous] 'well-pleasing;' a term frequently used by St. Paul, Rom. xii. 1, 2, xiv. 18, 2 Cor. v. 9, al., but in all other passages with relation to God or our Lord. Fritz. (Rom. l. c. Vol. III. p.31) rightly objects to the translation ' obsequiosus,' Bretsch.,
 præbeant], but doubtfully advocates a purely passive or rather neutral translation, 'is cui facile satisfacias,' 'homo contentus,' similarly Jerome, 'complacentes conditioni sure.' This certainly does not seem necessary, the reference is
more naturally to $\delta \in \sigma \pi$ trats, 'well pleasing to them,' i.e. 'approved by them (comp. Phil. iv. 18) in all things;' compare Clem. Alex. Sírom. vir. 13 (83), p. 883 (ed. Pott.), $\pi \rho \partial ̀ s \tau \grave{\nu} \nu$ K $v ́ p 1 o \nu \in u ̉ a ́ p \in \sigma \tau o s$
 $\nu \in \tau$ ós, where this passage or Rom. xiv. 18 seems to have been in the thoughts of the writer. $\quad \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \backslash \lambda \in ́ \gamma$ о $\nu \tau \alpha s$ ] 'gainsaying,' 'contradicting,' 'contradicentes,' Vulg., Clarom., and even more definitely Syr. $\overbrace{5}^{\infty}<0$ [obsistentes], thwarting or setting themselves against their masters' plans, wishes, or orders ;
 Chrys. The Auth. Vers., 'not answering again' ('non responsatores,' Beza), seems too narrow; comp. John xix. 12,

 in this same Epistle, ch. i. 9 , where à $\nu \tau \iota-$ $\lambda \epsilon$ ' $\gamma \in เ \nu$ probably involves some idea of definite opposition ; comp. Tittm. Synon. 1r. p. 9.
10. $\nu$ обфı ऽо $\mu \in ́ \nu$ оvs] 'purloining;' Acts v. 2, 3, with àmo of the thing from which purloined ; compare Josh. vii. 1, 2 Macc. iv. 32. This use of yoo $\phi \downarrow$. $=$ $\sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \omega ิ \nu, k \lambda \epsilon \dot{\pi} \tau \omega \nu$ (Hesych.), or with moro accurate reflexive reference, іठьотоьov́ $\mu \epsilon-$ vos (Suidas), requires no illustration; examples, if needed, will be found in

The grace of God has appeared, and teaches us to be godly in this world, and to look forward to our Redeemer's coming.

Wetstein. $\left.\quad \pi \tilde{\alpha} \sigma \alpha \nu \pi i \sigma \tau_{0} \epsilon \nu \delta \in \iota \kappa \nu.\right)$ 'showing forth all good fidelity;' द̇ $\nu \delta \epsilon \epsilon \kappa \nu$. is only used by St. Paul, and in Heb. vi. 10, 11 ; see notes on Eph. ii. 7 , where the word is brielly noticed, and compare Donalds. Gr. § 434, p. 447. The appended epithet araj̀ $\bar{\nu}$ can searcely refer to the actions, ' in rebus non malis,' Bengel, but seems merely to specify the 'fidelity' as true and genuine, opposed to a mere assumed, eye-serving $\pi i \sigma t i s$, comp. Eph. vi. G. On the various meanings of ríatıs in the N. T., compare Usteri, Lehrb. 11. 1. 1, p. 91, note, and on the use of $\pi \hat{a} \sigma a \nu$, 'every form of' (comp. ${ }^{\text {ev }} \nu$ $\pi \alpha ิ \sigma \iota \nu$ below), sce notes on Eph. i. 8. $\tau \nu \alpha \ldots . . \operatorname{\kappa o\sigma } \mu \hat{\omega} \sigma \iota \nu]$ 'in order that they may adorn;' definite object and purpose contemplated by such conduct. The apostle knew well the force of practical
 to use the words of Chrysost., must in those days have been, even though a silent, yet a most effective preacher of the Gospel. The concluding words, which refer to God the Father (1 Tim. i. 1, ii. 3, iv. 10, Tit. i. 3), not to God the Son, specify tho $\delta$ เכaбк. as being 'the doctrino of salvation,' 'the Gospel,' - an expression at which De W. unnecessarily takes exception.
11. $\gamma$ à $\rho$ gives the reason for the foregoing practical exhortations, and seems immediately suggested by the last words of ver. 10 , which, though specially referring to slaves, may yet be extended to all classes. It is thus really a reference to ver. 9,10 , but virtually to all that precedes from ver. 1 sq . The saving grace of God had among its objects the áyta $\mu \dot{s}$ of mankind ; compare Eph. i. 4, and the four good sermons by Beveridere, Serm. xc.-xciri. Vol. Iv. p. 225 sq. (A. C. Libr.). This $\chi$ ápıs necd not be
limited to the incamation (Theod., Jerome, al.), though this, as the context and perhaps éreфáv $\eta$ show, is the leading reference ; ' the grace of God doth not so bring salvation as to exclude tho satisfaction of Christ for our sins,' Beveridge, l. c. p. 229. 'E $\pi$ t申aivelv (ch. iii. 4 , Luke i. 79) and $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \pi \iota \phi \dot{d} \nu \in \iota a$ are normal words in connection with our Lord's first or second adrent (Waterl. Serm. vi. (Moyer's Lect.) Vol. 11. p. 134), possibly with a metaphorical reference, compare Acts xxvii. 20 ; the dogmatical reference in-
 ย̈тapgเข $\mu \eta \nu u ́ \sigma \eta \eta$ (Zonaras, Lex. Vol. 1. 1). 831), scems clearly indemonstrable.
$\dot{\eta} \sigma \omega \tau$ ńplos к. $\tau . \lambda$.$] 'the saving (grace)$ to all men,' 'that grace of God whereby alone it is possible for mankind to be saved,' Beveridge, l. c. p. 229. The reading is doubftul: Lachm., with $\Lambda \mathrm{C}^{1} \mathrm{D}^{1}$, rejects the article, Tisch., with $\mathrm{C}^{3} \mathrm{D}^{2} \mathrm{D}^{3} \mathrm{E}$ IKL, retains it, and apparently rightly. If the artiele were wanting, we should have a further predication, scil. ' and it is a saving grace to all men ' (Domalds. Gr. § 400), which would suljoin a secondary reference that would mar the simplicity of the context, $\pi$ aisévou $\alpha$ clearly involving the principal thought. Ifuther; in contending for the omission of the art. on the same grounds, does not appear to have been fully aware of the nature and force of these predicates. In either case, on account of the following $\hat{i} \mu \hat{a} s$, the dative $\pi a ̂ \sigma \iota \nu ~ \grave{\alpha} \nu \grave{\imath} \rho$. is most naturally and plausibly appended to $\sigma \omega \tau$ tipoos; joined with $\epsilon^{2} \pi \epsilon \phi$, it would be, as Wiesinger remarks, aimless and obstructive.
12. $\pi \alpha \& \delta \in v \in v \sigma a]$ 'disciplining us.' The proper force of this word in the N. T., 'per molestias crudire' (see notes on Eph. vi. 4, Trench, Synon. § 32), preserved in the 'corripiens' of Clarom.,

## 

must not here be lost sight of or (as in Bloomf.) obscured. Grace exercises its discipline on us (1 Cor. xi. 32, Heb. xii. 6) before its benefits can be fully felt or thankfully acknowledged : the heart must be rectified and the affections chastened before sanctifying grace can have its full issues ; compare (on the work of grace) the excellent sermon of Waterland, Serm. xxvi. Vol. v. p. 688.
iva к. T. 入.] 'to the intent that;' not merely the substance (De W., Huther:) but the direct object of the $\pi \alpha, \delta e i \alpha$. De Wette considers iva with the subjunct. as here only tantamount to an infin.; this is grammatically admissible after verbs of 'command,' 'entreaty,' al. (see Winer, Gr. §44. 8, compare notes on Eph. i. 17), but doubtful after a verb so full of meaning as maıōєv́eiv. The opinion of Chrys. seems definite with regard to Iva, but he is apparently inclined to join it with the finite verb, $\bar{\eta} \lambda \uparrow \uparrow \varepsilon \nu$ ó Xp. \%va àpvn-
 pear admissible.
¿ $\rho \nu \eta \sigma \alpha \mu \in \nu \circ$ ı] 'having denied;' not, ' denyiug,' Alf., - which, though grammatically defensible, seems to obscure that formal renunciation of $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \in \in \in \epsilon a \nu$ $\kappa . \tau . \lambda$. which was characteristic of the Christian profession, and to which the apostle scems here to allude. On the use of the verb, compare notes on ch. i. 16. The participle, as Wiesinger remarks, states on the negative side, the purpose of the $\pi a l \delta$ eia, which is further expressed on the positive in $\sigma \omega \phi \rho$. ک $\eta \sigma \omega-$ $\mu \epsilon \nu$. 'A $\sigma \in \in \in \tau a$, here not єí $\delta \omega \lambda o \lambda a \tau \rho \in i ́ a$
 'practical impiety' ('whatsoever is offensive or dishonorable to God,' Beverilge, Serm. xc. Vol. Iv. p. 239 sq.), is the exact antithesis to $\in \dot{v} \sigma \in \in \in \in a$, on which latter word see notes on 1 Tin. ii. 2.
 world,' 'all inordinate desires of the things
of this world,' Beveridge, l. c., compare
 ทึ $\mu \hat{\imath} \nu$ रрทचб $\pi \alpha ́ \nu \tau \alpha$ ö $\sigma \alpha$ èv $\tau \hat{\varphi} \pi \alpha \alpha o ́ v \tau \iota ~ B i ̣ \varphi ~ \sigma v \gamma к а т а \lambda u ́-~$
 adjective коб $\mu$ нos is only a $\delta i s \lambda \epsilon \gamma^{\prime} \gamma \mu$. in the N. T., here and (in a different sense) Heb. ix. 1, being commonly replaced in such combinations as the present by words or expressions of a more distinct ethical force, Gal. v. 16, Ephes. ii. 3, 1 Pet. ii. 11, 2 Pet. ii. 10, al. It is hero probably used in preference to баркıкós (i Pet. l. c.), as more general and inclusive, and as enhancing the extent of the abnegation: all ėmivvuiat are here included, which, in a word, eis roûtov $\mu \delta$ -
 $\lambda o v$, Coray ; comp. especially 1 John ii. 15. In later writers the moral reference is very decided; koopukoús, тò̀s ' 'is т $\eta \nu$
 Clem. Alexand. Strom. 11. 9. 41, Vol. I. p. 430 (cd. Pott.). Suicer, Thesiur. Vol. II. p. 147. On the varions meanings of $\kappa \delta \sigma \sigma \mu s$, compare notes on Gal. iv. 3.
$\sigma \omega \phi \rho \delta \nu \omega s$ к. $\left.\tau . \lambda_{.}\right]$' soherly, righteous$l y$, and godly.' The meanings assigned to $\sigma \omega \phi p$. (notes on 1 Tim. ii. 9), סıkalws (compare verse 5), and $\epsilon \dot{v} \sigma \epsilon \beta \hat{\omega}$ must not be too much narrowed, still in a general way they may be considered as placing Christian duties under three aspects, to ourselves, to others, and to God; compare Beveridgc, Serm. xcr. Vol. Iv. p. 253. The terms, indecd, are all general and comprehensive,- Sírauos, for example ('qui jus fasque servat,' Tittm. Synon. 1. p. 21), includes more than duty to ochers, but the order, as well as the meanings, alike hint that this distinction is not to be wholly ignored; compare Raphel, Annot. Vol. Ir. p. 639, Storr, Opusc. Vol. I. p. 197 sq.
$\hat{\epsilon} \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \hat{v} \nu$ aî̀ $\nu t]$ 'in the present world,' 'this present course of things.' On


the meaning of aiw ${ }^{i}$, see notes on Eph. ii. 2, comp. also notes on 2 Tim. iv. 10. 13. $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \delta \in \chi \delta \mu \in \nu$ о $\kappa$ к. $\tau . \lambda$.] 'looking for the blessed hope and manifestation of the glory; ' comp. Acts xxiv. 15, Gal. v. 5, è $\lambda \pi i \delta a a \mathfrak{a} \pi \epsilon \kappa \delta \in \chi$., where see notes. In this expression, which, on account of the close union of ${ }^{2} \lambda \pi i \delta \alpha$ with $\epsilon^{3} \pi เ \phi \alpha \dot{\nu} \in \iota a \nu$, is slightly different to Gal. l.c., è $\lambda \pi l_{\mathrm{s}}$ is still not purely objective, sc. the 'res sperata,' $\tau \delta$ é $\lambda \pi t \zeta \delta \mu \in \nu 0 \nu$ (Huth., al.), but is only contemplated under objective aspects ('objectivirt'), our hope being considered as something definite and substantive, compare Col. i. 5, $\dot{\epsilon} \lambda \pi i \delta a ~ \tau \eta े \nu ~ a ̉ \pi o-~$ $\kappa \in \not \mu \epsilon \nu \eta \nu \quad$ ẻv тoîs oủpavoîs, see notes in loc., and notes on Eph.i. 18. The nature of the hope is more fully defined by the gen. $\delta \delta \xi \eta$ s with which it is associated: see below. Theodoret seems to regard the whole expression as a mere $\hat{e} \nu$ dià
 $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ Ė $\lambda \pi i \delta \alpha a$ : this is not satisfactory; though the meaning may sometimes be practically not very different, yet such systems of interpretation are at best only crasive and precarious; see Fritzsche's careful Excursus, in his Comm. on Matth. p. 853 sq . The different objects of $\epsilon \lambda$ -
 $\kappa$. $\tau$. $\lambda$., are grouped together by Reuss, Theol. Chret. Iv. 20, Vol. II. p. 221.
$\tau \hat{\eta} s \delta \delta \xi \eta s$ is thus certainly not to be explained away as a mere epithct, 'glorions appearing,' Auth. Vers., Scholef,, but is a true and proper genitive, sce notes on Eph. i. 6 : there is a twofold
 ver. 11, the other an ė $\pi \iota \phi . \tau \hat{\eta} s \delta 6 \xi \eta \mathrm{~s}$, sce Beveridge, Serm. xcir. Vol. iv. p. 271 (A.-C. Libr.). It is also plainly depend'ent on $\dot{\epsilon} \lambda \pi i \delta \alpha$, as well as on $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \phi$. (De W. Wiesinger), the two substantives being closely united, and under the vinculum of a common article; sce Winer, Gir. §
19.4. d, p. 116. It is singular that Scholof. Hints, p. 126 (ed. 3), should not have given this interpretation more prominence.
$\tau$ ồ $\mu \grave{\epsilon} \gamma \dot{\alpha} \lambda o u$ k. т. ג.] 'of our great God and Saviour
 то̀ X X $\sigma \sigma$ тóv, Theod., sim. Chrys. It must be candidly avowed that it is very doubiful whether on the grammatical principle last alluded to the interpretation of this passage can be fully settled; see Winer, Gr. § 19.5, p. 118, and compare notes on Eph. v. 5. There is a presumption in favor of the adopted interpretation, but, on account of tho (defining) genitive $\dot{\eta} \mu \omega \bar{\mu}$ (Wincr, p. 114), nothing more: compare Alford in loc, who, it may be observed, by an oversight has cited this note as advocating the view to which it is opposed. When, however, we turn to exegetical considerations, and remember ( $a$ ) that $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \phi \alpha^{2} v \in L a$ is a term specially and peculiarly applied to the Son, and never to the Father, see esp. Waterland, Serm. vi. (Moyer's Lect.) Vol. ir. p. 134, comp. Beveridge, Serm. xcir. Vol. Iv. p. 268 ; (b) that the immediate context so especially relates to our Lord; (c) that the following mention of Christ's giving Himself up for us, of His abasement, does fairly account for St. Paul's ascription of a title, otherwise unusual, that specially and antithetically marks His glory ; (d) that $\mu \in \gamma$ d́doo would scem uncalled for if applied to the Father, see Usteri, Lehrb. II. 2. 4, p. 310, Hofmann, Schriftb. Vol. I. p. 127 ; and (e) lastly; observe that apparently two of the ante-Nicene (Clem. Alexand. Protrept. § 8, Vol. I. p. 7, ed. Pott., and Iyppolytus, quoted by Wordsw.) and tho great bulk of post-Nicene writers (see Midalleton, Gr. Art. p. 393, ed. Rose, Wordsw., Six Letters, p. 67 sq.) concurred in this interpretation, - when we candidly weigh
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all this cvidence, it does indeed seem difficult to resist the conviction that our blessed Lord is here said to be our $\mu$ ézas ©eds, and that this text is a direct, definite, and even studied declaration of the divinity of the Eternal Son. For further patristic citations, see the good note of Wordsworth in loc. It ought not to be suppressed that some of the best Vv., Vulg., Syr., Copt., Arm. (not however Ith.), and some Fathers of unquestioned orthodoxy adopted the other interpretation; in proof of which latter assertion, Reuss refers to Ulrich, Num Christus in etc. Deus appellatur, Tig. 1837, -a treatise, however, which the present editor has not seen. The note of De W., in keeping in the background the palmary argument ( $a$ ), scarcely reflects his usual candor; the true rendering of the clause really turns more upon exegesis than upon grammar, and this the student should not fail clearly to bear in inind.
14. ôs そ̌ $\delta \omega \kappa \in \nu$ ] 'who gave Himself?' Gal. i. 4, Eiph. v. 25 ; expansion of the preceding word $\sigma \omega \tau \hat{n} p o s$, with a distinct retrospective reference to $\hat{\eta} \chi$ ápss $\dot{\eta} \sigma \omega \tau \bar{\eta}$ ptos, ver. 11. The forcible Eauron' Himself, His whole self, the greatest gift ever given,' must not be overlooked ; comp. Beveridge, Serm. xcrii. Vol. iv. p. 285. $\left.\hat{v} \pi{ }^{\top} \rho \bar{\eta} \mu \mu \bar{\omega} \nu\right]$ 'for us.' On the meaning of this expression, which must not be here too hastily asserted as equivalent to àvil $\mathfrak{\eta} \mu \omega \hat{\nu} \nu$ (Beveridge, l. c.), see notes on Gal. iii. 13.
$\lambda v \tau \rho \omega \sigma \eta \tau a l]$ 'ransom,' 'pay for us a $\lambda u ́ t p o \nu$,' that $\lambda u ́ \tau p o \nu$ being his precious blood; see notes on Eph. i. 7, and comp. Matth. xx. 28, Mark x. 45. Not only does our Lord's death involve our reconciliation and our justification, but, what is now too often lost sight of, our ransom. ing and redemption (Beveridge, Serm. xc. Vol. '1v. p. 230), whether, as here, from
the bondage, or, as elsevvhere, from the penalties of àvopía: see Reuss, Theol. Cirea. 1v. 17, Vol. 11. p. 182 sq., who, with some deductions, has expressed himself clearly and satisfactorily.
à थо $\boldsymbol{i} \alpha \mathrm{s}$ ] 'iniquity;' properly 'lawlessness,' the state of moral license (àncaશapoía kal àvopía, Rom. vi. 19) which either knows not or regards not law, and in which the essence of $\sin$ abides, 1 John iii. 4 ; ' in à ào $\mu$ íq cogitatur potissimum legem non servari, sive quod ignota sit lex, sive quod consulto violetur,' Tittmann, Synon. I. p. 48 , where a distinction between àvopía and the more inclusive àóría (see notes on 2 Tim. ii. 19) is stated and substantiated.
каларíनŋ к. т. 入.] 'purify unto Himself a peculiar people;' affirmative statement (according to St. Yaul's habit) and expansion of what has been just expressed negatively. The tacit connection of àvopía and àkà apoia (sce last note) renders maiapi $\zeta_{\omega}$ very pertinent and appropriate. It does not seem necessary with Syr. (here incorrectly translated by Etheridge), Dc W., Wiesing., al., to supply nutas and understand $\lambda a \partial \nu$ as an accus. 'of the predicate,' scil., 'for a peculiar people:' the Greek commentt. (see esp. Theod.) all seem clearly to regard it a plain aecus. objecti; so Vulg., Clarom., and IEth. Tho Coptic Version, on the contrary, distinctly advocates the ' predicative' accusative.
$\pi \in \rho \leftarrow 0$ ט́бıo $]$ ' 'peculiar,' Auth. Ver., oinceiov, Thieod. ; very doubtfully inter-
 lum novum], and but little better by Vulg., 'acceptabilem,' and Chrys. $\begin{aligned} & \text { हैct- }\end{aligned}$ $\lambda$ equévav, both of which seem to recedo too far from the primary meaning. Tho most satisfactory commentary on this word (ä $\pi$. $\lambda \in \gamma \delta \mu$. in N. T.) is supplied by

 $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota ф \rho о \nu є і т \omega$.

Teach men to be obedient; we were once the contrary,

## 

 but have been saved and regenerated through God's mercy in Jesus Christ.1 Pet. ii. 9, $\lambda a d s$ eis $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \pi o i n \sigma t y$, compared with the oy of the Old Test.,
 comp. Exod. xix. 5, al.; see notes on Ephes. i. 14. It would thus seem that the primary meaning, 'what remains over and above to ' (comp. Bretschneider Lex.,- a little too coarsely expressed by the 'populum abundantem' of the Clarom., - has passed, by an intelligible gradation into that of $\pi \epsilon \rho เ \pi о є \epsilon \tau \delta \nu$, Hesych., е้кктทтov, Suid., and thence, with a little further restriction, oikeion; the connection of thought being that indicated by the Steph. (in Thesaur. s. v.), 'quæ supersunt a nobis reconduntur.' On the derivation of this word, see Winer, Gr. § 16. 3, p. 88, and on the general meaningr, see Suicer, Thesaur. s. v. Vol. Ir. p. 678, and Hammond in loc. In this clause the sanctifying, as in the former the redeeming, purpose of the atoning death of Christ comes mainly into prominence ; see Hammond, Pract. Catech. 1. 2, p. 24 (A.-C. Libr.).
 good worles; ' the gen. objecti specifying the objects about which the کŋितos was displayed ; compare Acts xxi. 20, xxii. 3, 1 Cor. xiv. 12, Gal. i. 14.
15. $\tau \alpha \hat{\nu} \tau \alpha$ к. т. $\lambda$.] Retrospective exhortation (ver. 1), serving as an easy conclusion to the present, and a preparation for a new portion of the Epistle. Taû̃a may be united with $\pi$ rapará $\lambda \in \iota$ (compare 1 Tim. vi. 2), but on account of the following é $\lambda \epsilon \gamma \chi \in$ is more naturally attached only to $\lambda \dot{\alpha} \lambda \epsilon \iota$; Titus is, however, not to stop with $\lambda \alpha \lambda \epsilon \hat{\nu} \nu$, he is to exhort the faithful, and reprove the negligent and wayward. On the practical duties of

Titus's office, compare South, Serm. v. Vol. i. p. 76 (Terg).
$\left.\mu \in \tau \grave{\alpha} \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \sigma s \epsilon^{\prime} \pi \iota \tau a \gamma \hat{\eta} s\right]$ 'with all (every exhivition of) authority;' $\mu \in \tau \grave{\alpha}$ à̉-
 also remarks on the inclusive máons. The term ėmıтayクे occurs 1 Tim. i. 1 , Tit. i. 3, in the more specific sense of 'commandment;' in the N. T. it is only used by St. Paul, viz., Rom. xvi. 26, 1 Cor. vii. 6,25 , and 2 Cor. viii. 8. The presen ; clause is probably only to be connected with the last verb (as Chrysost. and Theoph.), thus far corresponding to $\dot{\alpha} \pi о \tau \delta \mu \omega s$, chap. i. 13.
$\sigma o v \pi \in \rho \iota \phi \rho o \nu \in[\tau \omega]$ 'despise thec,' 'slight thee, ' not 'give no one just cause to do so,' Bloomf. (comp. Jerome), a meaning which is here purely imported; contrast 1 Tim. iv. 11, where the context supplies the thought. All the apostle says here is, as Hammond rightly paraphrases, 'permit not thy admonitions to be set at nought,' 'speak and act with vigor; ' the Cretan character most probably required it. The verb $\pi \epsilon \rho t \phi \rho$. is an $\ddot{\alpha} \pi$. $\lambda \in \gamma \delta \mu$. in the N. T., probably somewhat milder (compare Thucyd. I. 25) than the more usual kataфpoveiv. The ethical distinction urged by Jerome, that $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \phi \rho$. means an improper, while катафр. may mean a proper contempt (e.g. of sufferings, etc.), does not seem tenable.

Chapter III. 1. $\dot{\nu} \pi \sigma \mu\{\mu \nu \eta \sigma \kappa$ e] 'put in mind,' ' admone,' Vulg., Clarom. It is almost perverse in the opponents of the genuineness of these Fip. to call attention to this word; it occurs several times in the N. T., and though not elsewhere in St. Paul's Ep., except in 2 Tim. ii. 14,



is nearly the only word which suitably expresses this peculiar part of the teacher's office : in 1 Cor. iv. 17, another compound, àva $\mu \nu \eta=\sigma \epsilon$, is properly used as implying that previous instructions had been forgotten ; see Meyer in loc.
$\dot{\alpha} \rho \chi \alpha \hat{\imath} s \vec{\epsilon} \xi 0 v \sigma[a / s]$ 'to powers, authorities,' Luke xii. 11 : general, including all constituted governors, Roman and others. It is far from improbable that there is here an allusion to an insubordinate spirit which might have been showing itsclf not mercly among the Cretan Jews (Conyb.), but the Cretans generally (Wetst.). They had been little more than 125 years under Roman rule (Metellus subjugated Crete B. C. 67), their previous institutions had been of a dem-
 Polyb. Hist. vi. 46.4), and their own predatory and seditious character was only too marked; $\sigma$ тá $\sigma \in \sigma \iota$ каl фóvoıs каl
 lyb. vi. 46.9 ; see Meursius, Creta, Iv. 8, p. 226. This, perhaps, may be rendered further plausible by the use of $\pi \in i \vec{N} \alpha \rho \chi \in i \bar{V}$ ('coactus obsequi') as well as $\dot{i \pi} \pi \tau_{\alpha} \sigma$ $\sigma \in \sigma స \alpha$ ('lubens et sponte submittere'), see Tittm. Synon. II. p. 3, and compare
Syr., which by $\div \Delta \Delta_{\Delta}$ ! [subditus est $=\pi \in \mathscr{A}$ ] and $\because$ Séa $\quad$ [audivit $=$ ข̇тот.] seems to observe a similar distinction : contr. Vulg., Clarom. When $\pi \in \iota-$ Napx. stands alone, this meaning must not be too strongly pressed, comp. Acts v. 32 , xxvii. 21 ; the idea of obeying a superior power, scems, however, never wholly lost; compare Ammonius, de Vocab. Diff. p. 121. The omission of kal is justified by preponderant uncial authority, $\mathrm{ACD} \cdot \mathrm{E}^{1} \mathrm{FG}$, al., and is rightly adopted by Lachmann, Tischendorf,
and the majority of recent expositors. $\pi \in I \hat{N} \alpha \rho \kappa \in i \nu y$ may be connected with
 account of the preceding dapxais, seems more naturally taken absolutely ; so Vulgate, Syr. (appy.), and most modern commentators. Coray extends the ref-
 (comp. Aristot. Nic. Eth. x. 9), but this is scarcely in harmony with the immediate context.
2. $\mu \eta \delta \in \mathcal{\epsilon} \nu \beta \lambda \alpha \sigma \phi$.] 'to speak evil of
 duret; extension of the previous injunctions : not only rulers, but all men are to be treated with consideration, both in word and deed. On $\beta \lambda \alpha \sigma \phi$. see notes on 1 Tim. i. 13, and on the practical applications and necessary limitations of the precept, the exhaustive sermon of Barrow, Serm. xvr. Vol. I. p. 447 sq.
$\dot{\alpha} \mu \dot{\alpha} \chi \chi$ vs...$\dot{\epsilon} \pi t \in \iota k \in \hat{i} s]$ ' not contentious, furbearing ;' on the distinction between these two words, see notes on I Tin. iii. 3. The ėtetek̀ेs must have been, it is to be feared, a somewhat exceptional character in Crete, where an ఢцдфитоs $\pi \lambda \epsilon о \nu \epsilon \xi$ ía, exhibited in outward acts of aggression, кal ioía, кal катà коьvov (Polyb. vi. 46.9), is described as one of the prevailing and dominant vices. $\pi \rho \propto \cup \boldsymbol{v} \tau \eta \pi$.] 'meekness,' a virtue of the inner spirit, very insufficiently represented by the Syr. $1^{\circ} 20^{\circ} 0^{\prime}=\frac{8}{0}$ [benignitils] ; see notes on Eph. iv. 2, Gal. v. 23, and Trench, Symon. §42. On द̇̀ $\delta \epsilon \iota \kappa \nu$. see notes on Eph. ii. 7, and on the practical doctrine of universal benerolence involved in тávtas ảvi̊p. ( $\kappa a l$ ) 'Iovóaíous каl
 Waterl. Serm. II. § 1, Vol. v. p. 438.
3. $\bar{\eta} \mu \in \nu \quad \gamma \quad \alpha, \beta$ ] 'For we wene ; ' $\quad \mu \in \nu$ put forward emphatically, and forming a



sharp contrast to the better present (ver. 4). The $\gamma$ à $\rho$ supplies a reason for the foregoing command, especially for its concluding words : be meek and forbearing to others, for we once equally needed mercy and forbearance ourselves, and (ver. 4) have now experienced it. ' $\mathrm{H} \mu \mathrm{\epsilon} \hat{\mathrm{i}}$, as the context shows (comp. ver. 5), implies the apostle and all believers ; comp. Eph.ii. 3, where the reference is equally comprehensive.
 'foolish ; ' see notes on Gial. iii. 1. The meaning is said to be here somewhat more specific, nearly approaching to $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \sigma$ -
 W., Huth.) ; this, however, is not involved in the word itself (Hesych. à $\nu 0 \boldsymbol{\eta} \eta$ тos* $\mu \omega \rho o ́ s, ~ \grave{\lambda} \lambda i ̂ \uparrow \iota o s, \dot{\alpha} \sigma \dot{v} \nu \in \tau o s)$, but only reflected on it from the context.
$\pi \lambda \alpha \nu \omega \mu \in \nu \circ$ \& ] 'going astray;' ' errantes,' Vulg, Claromanus, Syr. ; not 'led astray;' Conyb., Alf. The associated participles, as well as the not uncommon use of $\pi \lambda a \nu a ̂ \sigma \hat{N}$ at in a similar sense (simply Matth. xviii. 12, 1 Pet. ii. 25, al. ; metaphorically Heb. v. 2, James v. 19), seem in favor of the neutral meaning. In 2 Tim. iii. 13, the antithesis suggests the passive meaning.
ŋो $\delta$ ovais] 'pleasures ;' a word not elscwhere used by St. Paul (a fact not lost sight of by De Wette), and only somewhat sparingly in the N. T. (sce Luke viii. 14, James iv. 1, 3, 2 Pet. ii. 13), but possibly suggested here by the notorious character in that respect of those indirectly alluded to ; compare Chrys. in loc. Jerome (1) illustrates the clause by references to St. Paul 'in his Saulship' (to use Hammond's language, Sermon xxx.) : the vices enumerated were, however, far more probably those of the people with whom, for the time being, the apostle is grouping himself. On the
derivation of токкi入. (only in Past. Epp.), see notes on 1 Tim. iii. 6.
$\kappa \alpha \kappa[a]$ ' malice; ' evil habit of the mind as contrasted with roynpla, which rather points to the manifestation of it; sce notes on Eph. iv. 31 (Transl.), Trench, Synon. § II. It is surely very hasty in Huther to assert that in 1 Cor: v. 8 it is merely synonymous with $\pi$ ovppia; see Taylor, on Repent. Iv. 1, who, however, is too narrow in his interpretation of какía, though correct in that of movnpla. The verb $\delta$ oá $\gamma \epsilon i \nu$ is a $\delta i s ~ \lambda \in \gamma o ́ \mu$., here and (with $\beta$ iov) 1 Tim. ii. 2.
 'odibiles,' Vulg. : it forms, as Wiesing. observes, a species of antithesis to $\mu$ Lбoû $\overline{-}$ $\tau \in s$ à $\lambda \lambda \dot{n} \lambda o u s$. Their conduct was such as to awaken hatred in others.
4. ì $\chi \rho \eta \sigma \tau$ ó $\tau \eta s$ ] 'the Findness, 'benignity,' 'benignitas,' Vulg., Clarom., sc. 'que in dandis beneficiis cernitur,' Fritz. Rom. 11. 4, Vol. I. p. 98 ; used in ref. to God, Rom. ii. 4, xi. 22, Eph. ii. 7 (comp. Clem. Rom. Epist. 1. 9, Epist. ad Diogn. §9); in reference to man 2 Cor. vi. 6, Gal. v. 22, Col. iii. 12. See notes on Gal.l.c., where it is distinguished from ảrầ $\omega \sigma$ úvך.
$\dot{\eta} \phi เ \lambda \alpha \nu \geqslant \rho \omega \pi\{\alpha]$ 'the love,' or more cxactly 'the love towards men,' Alf., 'humanitas,' Vulg.; used only again, in ref. to men, Acts xxviii. 2 ; compare Philo, Leg. ad Cai. § 10, Volume 11. p. 556 (Mang.), - where both words are associated, Raphel in loc., and for the general sentiment, John iii. 16. The article is repeated with each subst. to give prominence to each attribute, Green, Gram. p. 213. On é $\pi \epsilon \phi a ́ \nu \eta$, compare notes on ch. ii. 11, and on $\tau \omega \tau \hat{\eta} p o s ~ \Theta \in o \hat{v}$, sce notes on 1 Tim. i. 1. and Middleton, Gr. Art. p. 396, who remarks that it may be questioned whether in this place, as well as
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 Theod., al. (Rec., Griesb., Scholz); and perhaps rightly, as the law of attraction seems so very regularly preserved in the N. Test. Lachmumn reads $\hat{u}$ ė $\pi$ oring, with $\mathrm{AC}^{1} \mathrm{D}^{1} \mathrm{EG}$; al. ; Clem., al. (Huther, $A l f$.), - a reading that is not hastily to be rejected, but still apparently less probable than the former. Huther urges the probability of a correction from the ace. to the gen., but it is donbtful whether transcribers were so keenly alive to the prevailing coincidence of the N. T. in this respect with classical Greek as to have made the change from the intelligible accusative. Winer ( $G_{i} . \S 24.1, \mathrm{p} .147$ ) cites as similar violations of the ordinary rule, Jolm iv. 50 , vii. 39 , Acts vii. 16 ; the first and second passages have fair critical support for the ace., the third, however, scareely any. We retain then the reading of Tischend.
ch. i. 3, ii. 10, 1 Tim. ii. 2, the $\sigma \omega \tau \grave{\eta} \rho$ $\Theta \in \partial s$ be not Christ, though usually referred to the Father. In the present verse this surely cannot be the case (see ver. 6 , and comp. Usteri, Lehrb. II. 2. 4, p. 310), still we seem bound to mark in translation the different collocation of the words.
5. oúk '̇ $\xi$ € $\rho \gamma \omega \nu$ ] 'not by worlis,' i.e. in consequence of works; see notes on Gal. ii. 16, where this and other uses of ens aro compared and investigated. The negative is emphatic, and, as Bengel observes, refers to the whole sentence ;

 Nórŋs aủrov̂ є̇moin $\eta \epsilon$, Theophyl. The works are further defined as тà ėv $\delta$ เкаьooúvn, works done in a sphere or element
 comp. Winer, Gr. §. 48. a, p. 348.
 emphatic; the pronoun being added to make the contrast, with aùtoû é $\lambda$ пos still more clear and forcible. In the following clause karà denotes the indirect reason that an agreement with a norma suggests and involves, $={ }^{6}$ in consequence of,' ' quâ est miscricordiâ,' Fritz. Rom. II. 4, Vol. Y. p. 99 ; so Acts iii. 17, кaт⿳亠
 Phil. ii. 3, see Winer, Grr. § 49. d, p. 358.

The transition from the regular meaning of the 'model' to that of the 'course of things in accordance with it,' is suffciently easy and intelligible; compare Phil. ii. 3 (where $\kappa a{ }^{\prime}$ 'épí̂̀ctav stands in a kind of parallelism to the dative, $\tau \hat{\eta}$ тameเvoфpoov́vŋ), and still more definitely Arrian, Alex. 1. 99 (cited by Winer),

 V. 20. b, p. 240. Huther on 1 Pet. i. 2 draws a distinction between this use of $\kappa a \tau d$ and $\epsilon \xi$, but a bare remembrance of the primary meanings of the two prepp., origin (immediate) and model, will render such distinctions almost self-evident.
$\epsilon \sigma \omega \sigma \in \nu \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\alpha} s$ ] 'saved $u s$,' 'put us into a state of salvation,' Hammond; see especially 1 Pet. iii. 21, and compare Taylor, Life of Christ, 1. § 9, Disc. vI. 29. In this important dogmatical statement many apparent difficulties will completely vanish if we remember (1) that no mention is here made of the subjective conditions ou man's side ( $\delta<\grave{\alpha} \tau \hat{\jmath} s \pi\{\sigma \tau \in \omega s$, Eph. ii. 8, compare 1 Pet. l.c.), because the object of the whole passage is to enhance the description of the saving mercy of God, see Wiesing. in loc. ; (2) that St. Paul speaks of baptism on the supposition that it was no mere observance, but that it was a sacrament in which all
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that was inward properly and completely accompanied all that was outward: he thus can say in the fullest sense of the words, that it was a $\lambda o \hat{\tau} \tau \rho \circ \nu \pi a \lambda \iota \gamma \gamma \in \nu$ єбias, as he had also said, Gal. iii. 27, that as many as were baptized into
 put Him on, entered into vital union with Him,-a blessed state, which as it involved remission of sins, and a certain title, for the time being, to resurrection and salvation, so, if abided in, most sureIy leads to final $\sigma \omega$ rnpía; see Neànder, Planting, Vol. 1. p. 495 (Bohn), and esp. the brief but most perspicuous remarks of Waterland Euchar. vir. 3, Vol. Ir.p. 578 (compare ib. Ix. 3, p. 645), compared with the fuller statements of Taylor, Life of Christ 1. 9, Disc, vi. 14 sq. On the meaning of $\sigma \omega \dot{\omega} \omega$, compare (with caution) Green, Gramm. p. 318, but observe that 'to embrace the Gospel ' (p. 317) falls short of the plain and proper meaning of $\sigma \omega \bar{\omega} \epsilon \ell \nu$ ('salvum facere'), which even with ref. to present time can never imply less than 'to place in a state of salvation;' comp. Beveridge, Church. Cat. qu. 4, and notes on Eph. ii. 8.
$\delta \iota \grave{\alpha} \lambda$ ovtpô $\pi \alpha \lambda \iota \gamma \gamma$.] 'by means of the laver of regeneration,' 'per lavacrum regenerationis,' Vulg., Claroman.; the入outp. $\pi \alpha \lambda เ \gamma \gamma$. is the 'causa medians' of the saving grace of Christ, it is ' a means whereby we receive the same, and a pledge to assure us thereof;' ' partam a Christo salutem Baptismus nobis obsignat,' Calvin. Less 'than this cannot be said by any candid interpreter. The gen. $\pi a \lambda \iota \gamma \gamma$. apparently marks the attribute or inseparable accompaniments of the $\lambda$ out $\rho \delta{ }^{2}$, thus falling under the general head of the possessive gen., Scheucrl. Synt. § 16. 3, p. 115 : for examples in the N. T. of this sort of gen. of 'inner reference,' see especially the collection in Winer, Gr. § 30. 2. $\beta, \mathrm{p} .169$. As for
any unexegetical attempts (Matth., al.) to explain away the plain force and lexical meaning of $\lambda o v \tau \rho \delta \nu$ (see notes on Eph.v. 26), it may be enough to say, in the words of Hooker on this subject, that 'where a literal construction will stand, the farthest from the letter is commonly the worst,' Eccl. Pol. v. 59. 2 ; see John iii. 5 , the reff. in Waterland, Works, Vol. Iv. p. 428 , and compare the fair comments of Hofmann, Weiss, u. Erf. rı. p. 233 sq., and Schriftb. II. 2, p. 170 sq. On the true meaning of $\pi a \lambda \iota \gamma \gamma \in \nu \in \sigma\{a(\mathrm{Syr}$.


 see the able treatise on this text by Waterland, Works, Vol. iv. p. 427 sq., a tract which, though extending only to thirty pages, will be found to include and to supersede much that has been written on this subject: Bethell on Regen. (ed. 4) and the very good note of Wordsworth in loc. may also be profitably consulted. каl ${ }^{\text {à } \nu \alpha \kappa \alpha \iota \nu . ~}$ к. т. $\lambda_{.}$] 'and renewing of the Holy Spirit,' i. e. 'by the Holy Spirit,' the second gen. being that of the agent, more detinitely expressed by D1E1FG, al., ả akacu. $\delta i a ̀ ~ \pi \nu . \quad$ á $\gamma$, Clarom. ('renov. per Sp. sanctum'), and some Latin Ff. : comp. notes on Eph. iv. 23. The construction of the first gen. àvaralv. is somewhat doubtful. It may be regarded cither (a) as dependent on the preceding $\delta$ á, as in Syr., Jerome (' per renovationem'), al. ; sce John iii. 5, and compare Blunt, Lect. on Par. Priest, p. 56 ; or (b) as dependent on $\lambda$ dovtpov̂, Vulg., Clarom., Copt., Arm., Ath.-Platt, none of which repeat the prep. before àvakaıv.; see Waterland, Regen. Vol. iv. p. 428, who briefly notices and removes the objection (compare Alf.) founded on the inclusive character that will thus be assigned to Baptism.




On the whole the latter seems most simple and satisfactory: àvakaıv, к. r. $\lambda$. must not, however, be considered as merely explanatory of $\pi a \lambda t \gamma \gamma \in \nu \in \sigma$ ias (De Wette, Huther), but as co-ordinate with it, $\pi a \lambda \iota \gamma \gamma$. and $\dot{a} \nu a k a \iota \nu$. (only here and Rom. xii. 2) 'being nearly allied in end use, of one and the same original, often going together, and perfective of each other,' Waterland, l. c. p. 428 ; see Hofmann, Schrifil. 11. 2, p. 171. The exact genitival relation $\pi \alpha \lambda เ \gamma \gamma$. and ${ }^{2} \nu \alpha \kappa \alpha \iota \nu$. cannot be very certainly or very confidently defined. The gen. is most probably an obscured gen. of the content, representing that which the $\lambda$ out $\rho \partial \nu$ involves, comprises, brings with it, and of which it is the ordinary and appointed external vehicle ; compare Mark i. 4, $\beta \alpha \alpha_{\pi} \tau \iota \sigma \mu \alpha$ $\mu \in \tau a v o i ́ a s$ (' which binds to rep.'), which, grammatically considered, is somewhat similar, and as for examples of these obscurer uses of the gen., see Winer, Gr. § 30. 2, p. 168, 169. The distinction between Regeneration and Renovation (preserved in our Service of Confirmation), in respect of (a) 'the 'causa efficiens,' (b) duration, and (c) recurrence, -three important theological differentice, is nowhere more perspicuously stated than by Waterland l.c. p. 436 ; compare notes on Eph. iv. 23, and there observe the force of the tenses. Lastly, for a comparison between 'regeneratio' and ' conversio,' see Ebrard, Dogmatik, §454, Vol. II. p. 357.
 pendent on 入outpov̂ (Calv.), or on an omitted prep. (Heydenr.), but, according to the usual rule of attraction, on the gen. immediately preceding: oủ $\mu \delta \nu o \nu$
 $\lambda \omega ิ s$ тoútou $\mu \in \tau \in ́ \delta \omega \kappa \epsilon \nu$, Theophyl.
'Є $\xi \in \in \chi \in \in \nu$ ] 'poured out,' 'shed,' 'non di-
cit dedit sed effudit,' Corn. a Lap.; in similar reference to the Holy Spirit, Acts ii. $17,18,33$. There does not, however, appear to be here any special reference to the Penter:ostal effusion (Olsh.), nor to the communication to the Church at large (Est., comp. De W.), but, as the tense and context (ver. 7) seem rather to imply, to individuals in baptism. The next clause points out through whose mediation this blessed effusion is bestowed.
$\delta \iota{ }^{\prime}{ }^{~} \mathrm{I} \eta \sigma . \mathrm{X} \rho$. is not to be separated, as in Mill, Griesb., Lachm., by a comma from the clause $\epsilon_{\xi} \xi \in \chi \in \in \nu \kappa_{0} \tau_{0} \lambda_{\text {., }}$ but connected closely with it: if the words be referred to $\varepsilon \sigma \sigma \omega \sigma \in \nu$, there will be not only a slight tautology é $\sigma \omega \sigma \in \nu$ - $\delta \iota a ́$, $\sigma \omega \tau \hat{\eta} \rho o s$, but the awkwardness of two clauses with סia each dependent on the same verb. Thus then the whole is described as the work of the Blessed Trinity. The Father saves us by the medium of the outward laver which conveys the inward grace of the regenerating and renewing Spirit; that Spirit again is vouchsafed to us, yea, poured out abundantly on us only through the merits of Jesus Christ. So the Father is our $\sigma \omega \tau \eta \rho$, and the Son our $\sigma \omega \tau \hat{\eta} p$, but in different ways ; 'Pater nostræ salutis primus auctor, Christus vero opifex, et quasi artifex,' Justiniani.
7. iva к. т. ג.] Design of the more
 nearer $\begin{gathered} \\ \xi\end{gathered} \in \chi \in \in \nu$ (Wiesing., Alf.). The latter construction is fairly defensible, but apparently not so simple or satisfactory. Though some prominence is given to $\begin{gathered} \\ \xi\end{gathered} \in \chi \in \in \nu$, both by the adverb $\pi \lambda o u \sigma i \omega s$, and by the defining words $\delta \iota a ̀{ }^{\prime} \mathbf{I} \eta \sigma$. X $\rho$., yet the whole context seems to mark $\epsilon \sigma \omega \sigma \in \nu$ as the verb on which the final clause depends. We were once in a hopeless and lost state, but we were res-


Teach men to maintain good works; avoid idle questions, aud shun an obstinate heretic.


who not mercly saved us from the $\delta 0 u \lambda$ eía of sin, but associated with it the gracious intent thiat we should become кл $л \rho о \nu \delta$ боя of eternal life.
 $\tau \in s$ ] 'justified,' in the usual and more strict theological sense ; not, however, as implying only a mere outward non-imputation of sin, but as involving a ' mutationem status,' an acceptance into new privileges and an enjoyment of the benefits thereof, Waterl. Justıf. Vol. vr. p. 5 : in the words of the same writer, 'justifieation cannot be conceived without some work of the Spirit in conferring a title to salvation,' ib. p. 6.
$\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \in \ell \nu o u$ may be referred to the Holy Spirit (Wiesing.), but is apparently more correctly referred to God the Father. The Holy Spirit is undoubtedly the efficient (1 Cor. vi. 11), as our Lord is the meritorious cause of our justification; the use, however, of the expression $\chi$ apis, which in reference to $\delta$ watocúv $\eta$ and $\delta$ rauów seems almost regularly connected with the principal cause, the Father (Rom. iii. 24), and its apparent retrospective reference to ${ }_{\epsilon} \xi{ }^{\xi} \rho \rho \gamma \omega \nu$, ver. 5 , renders the latter interpretation much more probable ; compare Waterland Justif. Vol. vi. p. 9. The pronoun excivou seems to have been used to preclude a reference to 'I $\eta \sigma o u ̄ \mathrm{X} \rho$., which so immediately precedes.
$\left.\kappa \alpha \tau^{\prime} \cdot \vec{\epsilon} \lambda \pi i \delta \alpha\right]$ 'in respect of hope,' 'according to hope,' 'secundum spem,' Vulg., Clarom., surcly not 'through hope,' Conyb., - a needless violation of the usual furce of the preposition. These words may be connected with (̧wîs aiwviou (Coray, Matth., Alf.; compare Tit. i. 1), but as $\kappa \lambda \eta \rho o \nu o ́ \mu o t$, a term not in any way clucidated by a foregoing context (as is the case in all other passages where it stands alone) would thus be left wholly isolated, it seems more natural to regard them as a restrictive addition to the lat-
ter words, - $\kappa \alpha \hat{\omega} \omega े s ~ \grave{\eta} \lambda \pi i \sigma \alpha \mu \in \nu$, oüт $\omega s$ àmo$\lambda a v ́ \sigma o \mu \in \nu$, Chrysost. ; so, very distinctly,
 §凶ท̂s aich, is really future (compare Rom. viii. 24, where $\epsilon \lambda \pi i \delta t$ is probably a dat. modi, seo Meyer in loc.), though present in respect of hope; $\epsilon \mathfrak{l} \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ oüT $\omega \mathrm{s} \dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon \gamma \nu \omega \sigma$ -



 remark of Dc Wette that St. Paul does not elsewhere specifically join $\kappa \lambda \eta \rho o \nu$. or eren é $\lambda \pi i$ ls (except in this Ep.) with $\left.{ }^{〔} \omega\right\rangle$ ai $\omega \nu$. is true, but can scarecly be considered of moment, as substantially analogous sentiments (compare Ephes. i. 18, 1 Thess. v. 8) can be adduced without difficulty ; comp. Wieseler in loc.
8. $\pi \iota \sigma \tau \delta s$ ' $\delta$ óyos] 'Faithful is the saying,' in emphatic reference to what has been asserted in the preceding verses $4-7$, and to the important doctrines they

 Chrysost. On this formula see notes on 1 Tim. i. 15.
$\pi \in \rho \grave{\imath} \tau$ oú $\tau \omega \nu \delta \iota \alpha \beta \in \beta$.] 'make asseveration concerning these things;' not 'hree asseverare,' Beza, Auth. Ver., De Wette, but, as in 1 Tim. i. 7 (where see notes), 'dehis [non de rebus frivolis, Beng.] affirmare,' Clarom., changed for the worse in Vulg. to 'confirmare : ' comp. Scholef. Hints, p. 127 (ed. 3). The olyject and intent of the order is given in the following clause.
$\phi \rho o \nu \tau i \zeta \omega \sigma \iota \nu]$ 'be careful;' $\quad \dot{\pi} \pi$. $\lambda \in$.
 $\delta \iota \eta \nu \in \kappa$ ès ě $\chi \omega \sigma \iota$, Theophylact. 'Vult cos studium suum curamque huc applicare, et videtur quum dicit $\phi p o \nu \tau$, eleganter alludere ad inanes eorum contemplatio: nes, qui sine fructu et extra vitam philosophantur,' Calvin. The constructions

##  

of фроит. and $\begin{gathered}\text { érфроит. are noticed by }\end{gathered}$ Thomas M. p. 289 (ed. Bern.).
$\left.\pi \rho \cdot \frac{1 \sigma \tau \alpha \sigma \tau}{} \alpha_{t}\right]$ 'to be forward in, to

 612, see Rost u. Palm, Lex. s. v. Vol. ir. p. 1122. The Vulg., Clarom. ('bonis operibus proesse '), and some other translations endeavor to retain the primary meaning of the verb, but not successfully nor idiomatically. Justiniani compares 'prefectus annonæ;' Estius adopts the gloss, 'tanquam operum exactores et prefecti;' Pricæus (ap. Poli Syn.) paraphrases by $\dot{\text { jomembas eivat; alii alia. All }}$ this, however, seems slightly forced; the worl appears chosen to mark a ' prompt, sedulous attention to (comp. Polyb. Hist.
 tice of, good works,' but, as the examples adduced appear to show, scarcely involves any further idea of 'bene agendo preceedere,' Beza, al. : see the numerous examples quoted by Kypke, Obs. Vol. ir. 381, Loesner, Obs. p. 430.
$\kappa \alpha \lambda \hat{\omega} \nu$ Е̌p $\rho \omega \nu$ ] 'good zoorks;' not merely with reference to works of mercy (Chrys.), but (as in ch. ii. 7, iii. 14, al.) generally, and comprehensively. The recurrence of this expression in the Pastoral Epistles (ver. 14, 1 Tim. v. 10, 25, vi. 18 , comp. 1 Tim. ii. 10, 2 Tim. ii. 21, Tit. iii. 1) has been often noticed; all that need be said is, that the nature of the crrors condemned in these Epistles was exactly such as required the reiteration of such a command. It was not to be a hollow, specious, falsely ascetic, and sterile Christianity, but one that showed itself in outward actions ; compare Wiesing. Einleit. § 4, Neander, Plant., Vol. I. p. 343 (Bohn).
$\pi \in \pi t \sigma \tau$. $\theta \in \hat{\omega}$ ' who have believed God,' - God, not perhaps without some slight
emphasis ; 'non dixit qui credunt hominibus sed qui credunt Deo,' Jerome. The expression is certainly not to be limited to the Gentile Christians (Mack), but includes all who by God's grace had been led to embrace His $\lambda$ óyov and $\delta \boldsymbol{\imath} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \sigma-$ калíà (ch. i. 3, ii. 10), De W., Wiesing. On the constructions of $\pi i \sigma \pi / s$ and $\pi / \sigma-$ $\tau \epsilon \dot{b} \omega$. see notes on 1 Tim. i. 16.
$\tau \alpha \hat{v} \tau a]$ 'these things,' scil. these instructions, this practical tenching (Fell), to which the $\mu \omega \rho a l$ § $\eta \tau \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma$ eis in the next ver. forms a sharp and clear contrast. Wie-
 this, however, even if it escapes tautology, does not equally well maintain the antithesis to the meaning here assigned
 $\lambda \grave{~(' g o o d, ' ~ p e r ~ s e, ~ o p p . ~ t o ~} \mu$ d'rutuol, ver. 9)
 д $\nu \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\imath} \rho \omega$ ótors another; compare notes on 1 Tim. ii. 3.
9. $\{\eta \tau \dot{\eta} \boldsymbol{\eta} \in \mathrm{ts}$ ] 'questions (of controversy) ;' exactly as in 1 Tim. i. 4 , where see notes. In the latter passage De Where assigns the meaning 'Streitigkeiten,' and yet in his note on the passage adopts the present meaning 'Streitfra-gen,-a self-contradiction by no means usual in that careful commentator. The word is only used by St. Paul in the Pastoral Epistles, 1 Tim. i. 6, vi. 4, 2 Tim. ii. 23. On the reveadorias, sec notes on 1 Tim. i. 4 , where the expression is investigated: it is here associated with § $\eta$ r. as probably marking the leading subject and theme of these controversial discussions ; compare Winer, Gr. § 57. 2. obs., p. 515. ёpers кая $\mu d \chi$. $\nu \circ \mu$.] 'strifes and contentions about the law' are the results of these foolish and unpractical questions; see 1 Tim. vi, 4, 2 Tim. ii. 23. The adj. vouнкаl is not to be referred to both substantives (Heydenr.), but only to the latter; thè


10. $\delta \epsilon \nu \tau \epsilon \in \rho \alpha \nu \nu 0 v \uparrow \uparrow \epsilon \sigma i \alpha \nu]$ So Rec. with ACKL; mss.; Vulg., al.; many Gr. and Lat. Ff. (Griesb., Scholz, Lachm., Huth., Alf.). The reading adopted by Tisch., míav voùt $\sigma$ íà (DEFG; Clarom., Sangerm, Syr.-Philox. ; Chrys., Theororet (1); Lat. Ff.) кai $\delta \in u \tau \epsilon ́ p a \nu$, though fairly supported, does not seem so satisfactory ; transcribers appear to have felt a difficulty about the close union of $\mu$ ia and $\delta \in \nu \tau \epsilon \in \rho \alpha$ (I)E ; Clarom., Sangerm., Copt. read $\delta$ óo), and to have introduced in consequence variations in the text.
$\mu \alpha^{\prime} \chi . \nu o \mu$. were a special and prevailing form of the ${ }^{\prime} p \epsilon \iota s$, just as the $\gamma \in \nu \in \alpha \lambda$. were of the $\zeta \eta \tau \eta \sigma \epsilon t s$, Wiesing. The contentions perhaps turned on the authority and application of some of the precepts in the law ; comp. i. Tim. i. 4.
$\pi \in \rho \iota t \sigma \tau a \sigma$ o] 'avoid, go out of the way of,' 'devita,' Vulg., Clarom. ; see notes on 2 Tim . ii. 16, the only other passage in St. Paul's Epistles where the word occurs. $\mu \alpha ́ \tau \alpha \iota \circ \iota]$ 'vain,' from which nothing of true value results, in opp. to калá, ver. 8. Mátalos is here and James i. 26, as in Attic Greek, of two terminations; the fem. occurs 1 Cor. xv. 17, 1 Pet. i. 18. On the distinction between кévos (contents,-' das Gehaltlose ') and $\mu \alpha ́ \tau \alpha l o s ~(r e s u l t s,-' d a s ~ E r-~$ folglose') see Meyer on 1 Cor. xv. 17: Tittmann (Synon. I. p. 173) compares them with the Lat. 'inanis' and 'vanus.'
10. $\alpha i \rho \in \tau \iota \kappa \delta \nu \quad$ á $\nu N \rho \omega \pi 0 \nu]$ ' $A n$ heretical man,' 'a man who causeth divisions ;' 'quisquis suâ proterviâ unitatem ecclesiæ abrumpit,' Calvin. The exact meaning here of this word (an $\alpha \dot{\alpha} \pi$. $\lambda \in \gamma \delta \mu$. in N. T.) must not be deduced from the usage of later writers, but simply from the apostle's use of the substantive from which it is derived. The term aipé $\sigma \in$ es occurs (not 'often,' Huther, but) twice in St. Paul's Epistles,-1 Cor. xi. 19, where it denotes apparently something more aggravated than $\sigma \chi^{i} \sigma \mu a \tau \alpha$, ' dissensions of a more matured character' ('nullum schisma non aliquam sibi confingit hæresim,' Jerome), and Gal. v. 20, where it is enumerated after $\delta \iota \chi 0 \sigma \tau \alpha \sigma i a u$.

In neither case, however, does the word seem to imply specially ' the open espousal of any fundamental error' (the more definite cecles. meaning ; comp. Origen on Tit. Vol. Iv. p. 695, Bened., Waterl. Doct. of Trin. ch. Iv. Vol. III. p. 461), but, more generally, 'divisions in church matters,' possibly, of a somewhat matured kind, $\tau \grave{\alpha} s$ фı $\lambda$ оעєuкías $\lambda \in ́ \gamma \in \iota$, Theod. on 1 Cor. l. c., see Suicer, Thesaur. s. v. I. 3, Vol. I. p. 120. Thus, then, aipetıkds ávi̊p. will here be one who gives rise to such divisions by erroncous teaching, not necessarily of a fundamentally heterodox nature, but of the kind just described, ver. 9 ; comp. ch. i. 14 . If we adopt this apparently fair and reasonable interpretation, the objections of De Wette and others, founded on the later and more special meanings of aipe $\sigma t s$ and aipetukós, wholly fill to the ground.
$\mu \in \tau \grave{\alpha} \mu\{a \nu$ к. т. $\lambda$.$] 'after one and \alpha$ second [unavailing] admonition;' Titus is not to contend, he is only to use $\nu 0 v 9 \in \sigma$ ía, if that fail he is then to have nothing further to do with the offender. On the distinction between $\nu 0 v \uparrow \in \sigma i ́ a$ ('quæ fit verbis') and $\pi \alpha \iota \delta \in i ́ a$ ('quæ fit per pœenas'), sce notes on Ep/h. vi. 4 ; and on the use of $\epsilon$ is for $\pi \rho \hat{\omega} \tau 0 s$, here associated with $\delta \in u ́ r \epsilon \rho o s$, and consequently less peculiar and Hobraistic than when alone, as in Matth. xxviii. 1, Mark xvi. 2, al., see Winer, Gr. § 37. 1, p. 222.
 off from '] Syriac, 'devita,' Vulg., Clarom. ; 'monere desine; laterem lavares,'

## 


 Our brethren must not be unfruitful．

Beng．：sce notes on 1 Tim．iv．7．There is nothing in this or the associated words which favors any definite reference to for－ mal excommunication，$=$ є̌кßал入є，Vi－ trịnga（de Vet．Syn．111．1．10，p．756）， who compares the $\nu$ סovitcaia to the＇cor－ reptio＇or＇excommunicatio privata＇of the Jews；similar．Taylor，Episc．§ 15. This，however，is importing into a gen－ eral word a special meaning．As we certainly have such expressions as mapal－
 Apopth． 206 A ，and even àm кal Tク̂S oikías $\pi \alpha p a \iota \tau \in i ̄ \sigma \vartheta a l$ ，Lucian，$A b$－ dic．§ 19 ；we perhaps may say with Wa－ terland（Doctr．of Trin．ch．4，Vol．III． p．466），that mapaırồ＇implies and infers a command to exclude them；＇but St． Paul＇s previous use of the word does not apparently justify our asserting that it is here formally expressed：see notes in Translation．

11．$\epsilon i \delta \omega s$ ］＇as thou knowest，＇by the ill success of thy admonitions；reason for the injunction to have nothing to do

 $\dot{\epsilon} \xi \in \sigma \tau \rho \alpha \pi \tau \alpha$, ］＇is perverted，＇Syriac ○々， turned，thorouchly，inside out；＇Schol． on Arist．Nub．88，à $\pi \grave{\partial} \mu \in \tau \alpha ф о р a ̂ s ~ \tau \omega ̂ \nu ~$


 xxxii．20，$\gamma \in \nu \epsilon \in \alpha, ~{ }_{\epsilon} \xi \in \sigma \tau \rho a \mu \mu \in ́ \nu \eta$ ，Hebrew －ㄷํำ pouid thus appears to denote the com－ plete inward corruption and perverseness of character which must be predicated of any man who remains thus proof against twice－repeated admonitions．Baur（it is to be feared），only to support his mean－
ing of aiperıkós，refers $\epsilon \xi \in \sigma \tau \rho$ ．to the out－ ward act of the man，＇has gone away from us ；＇this，as Wiesing．properly re－ marks，would more naturally be à $\pi 0$－
 крıтоs］＇self－condemned；＇the reason why he is to be left to himself；he has been warned twice and now sins against

 gravating circumstance is not that the man condemns himself directly and ex－ plicitly，as this might be a step to recov－ ery，but that he condemns himself indi－ rectly and implicilly，as acting against the law of his mind，and doing in his own particular case what in the general he condemns；see especially Waterland， Doct．of Trin．ch．rv．Vol．1II．p．464， where this expression is fully investi－ gated．

12．Tú $\mathfrak{\text { เкоу］On Tychicus，whom }}$ the apostle（Col．iv．7）terms $\delta$ à $\gamma a \pi \eta \tau\rangle s$
 $\lambda \operatorname{los}^{e} \nu \mathrm{~K} \nu \nu p^{\prime}(\varphi$ ，see the notes on 2 Tin．iv． 12，Eph．vi．21．It would seem not im－ probable that either Artemas or Tychi－ cus were intended to supply the place of Titus in Crete during his absence with the apostle．Of Artemas nothing is known．

Nเкómo $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \iota \nu$ ］
There wero several cities of this name， one in Cilicia（Strabo xrv．676），another in Thrace on the river Nestus，a third in Epirus（Strabo，xIr．325），built by Au－ gustus after the battle of Actium．It is extremely difficult to decide which of these cities is here alluded to；Schrader （Paulus，Vol．I．p．118）fixes on the first ；the Greek commentators，the sub－ scription at the end of the Epistle（Nıкот． $\tau$ र̂s Maкєठovias，to which country it was near，compare Theodoret），and some



modern writers, on the second; Wieseler (Chronol. p. 335) and others on the third. Perhaps the second may seem to harmonize better with the seanty notices of the last journey from Asia Minor to the West in 2 Tim. iv. 10 sy. (Neauder, Planting, Vol. 1. p. 344, Bohn), but as the city of Epirus appears to have been a place of much more importance, and not unsuitable as a centre for missionary operations, it may perbaps be assumed as not improbably the place here alluded to ; see Conyb. and Howson, St. Paul, Vol. ir. p. 572 (ed. 2).
$\kappa \epsilon \in \kappa \rho \iota \kappa a]$ ' $I$ lhave deternined,' with dependent infin., a form of expression used elsewhere by St. Paul, 1 Cor. vii. 37 (perf.), 2 Cor. ii. 1 (aor.).
$\pi a \rho a \chi \in \iota \mu \dot{\alpha} \sigma a t]$ ' 'to winter ;' Demosth.
Phorm. 909. 14, тарахєчй́Sovть е̇кє̂̂, ib. Dionys. 1292, Polyb. Hist. 11. 64. 1, in1. 33. 5, al. : in this compound the prep. $\pi a p \alpha ̀$ seems to mark the locality at which the action was to take place, comp. Rost u. Palm, Lex. s. v. iv. 1, Vol. 11. p. 670. There does not appear anything in the expression from which any historical deduction can be safely drawn ; possibly the winter was drawing near, and the apostlo on his way (ėeє̂̄, 'non dicit hic,' Beng.) to Nicopolis.
13. $\mathrm{Z}_{\eta \nu \hat{a} \nu]} \mathrm{A}$ name perhaps con-
 it nothing is known. It is doubtful whether the term voumòs implies an acquaintance with the Roman (Grot.) or Hebrew law (De W.). The latter is the opinion of Chrysost., Jerome, and Theoph., and is perhaps slightly the more probabie; comp. Math. xxii. 35. For notices of an apocryphal work, assigned to Zenas, 'De vitì et actis Titi,' ' comp. Fabricius Cod. Apocr. Vol. II. p. 831.

in Cod. D ap. Acts xviii. 24], or possibly Apollodorus,-an cloquent (íórios, Acts l. c., seo Meyer in loc.) Jewv of A1exandria, well versed in the Scriptures; anil a disciple of St. John the Baptist; ho was instructed in Cluristianity by Aquila and Priscilla (Acts xviii. 26); preached the Gospel with signal success in Achaia and at Corinth, and appears to have maintained relations of close intimacy with St. Paul, compare 1 Cor. xvi. 12. There appears no good reason for supposing any greater differences between the teaching of St. Paul and $\Lambda$ pollos (Neander, Plunting, Vol. I. p. 23) sq., Bohn), than may be referred to the mere outward form in which that teaching possibly might have been communicated, and which comes from that one and the same Spirit which $\delta$ ouppeit $: \delta i \not \subset$
 see Winer, $\quad 2$ WB. Art. 'Apollos,' Vol. 1. p. 68. Much that has been recently advanced on the differences between St . Panl and Apollos is very doubtful and very unsatisfactory.
$\pi \rho \delta \pi \epsilon \mu \psi \circ \nu]$ 'conduct,' 'forward on their journey,' with the further idea, as the context seems to require, of supplying their various needs; compare 3 John 6.
14. oi $\dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon ́ \tau \in \rho \circ$ ]] 'our brethren in Crete,' not ' nostri ordinis homines ' (Beza), scil. 'Apollos, Tychicus, et alii quos mittimus si quo in loco resederint’ (Grot.), as this would imply a comparison between them and St. Paul, and would involve a meaning of проtтт. кал. ${ }^{\epsilon} \rho \gamma$. ('habere domi officinam aliquam, me imitantes, Acts $x x .34$,' Grot.), somewhat arbitrary, and wholly different to
 oi $\pi \epsilon \rho \ell \sigma \epsilon \in(T h e o p h$.$) , the кai tacitly com-$ paring them not with heathens (Hof-
 ผิбぃ» वैкартои．
Salutations and Benedic． tion．
 $\dot{\nu} \mu \hat{\nu} \nu$ ．
mann，Sclriftb．Vol．11．2，p．429），but with Titus；＇let these Cretan brethren of ours be not backward in co－operating with thee in these acts of duty and be－ nevolence．＇On троїтт．к．к．$\lambda$ ．，see notes on ver． 8.
$\epsilon$ is $\tau$ às àvayk． xpeias］＇with reference to the necessary wants ；＇i．e．to supply them：compare
 The article appears to mark the known and existing wants．
ăк $\alpha \rho \pi 0$ ］＇＇unfruifful，＇not solely and specially with reference to the wants of their teachers（＇quicunque evangelistis non ministraverint，＇Just．），but also with reference to their own moral state，i．e． without showing practical proofs of their faith by acts of love．
15．oi $\mu \in \tau^{\prime}$＇$\mu \mathrm{o} \hat{v}$ ］＇those with me，＇in my company，journeying or abiding with me；compare Gal．i．2，of oìv £̇ $\mu \mathrm{ol}$ ，where the idea of union in action（coherence）， rather than mere local union（eo－exist－ ence），seems intended to be expressed； seo Krüger，Sprachl．§ 68．13． 1.
Toùs фi入ồעtas K．T．入．］＇those who love us in faith，＇those who love me in
the sphere of faith；not merely $\pi \iota \sigma \tau \omega \bar{s}$ kal $\dot{\alpha} \delta \delta \lambda \lambda \omega s$ ，Theophilact，or $\delta \iota \grave{\alpha} \pi i \sigma \tau \epsilon \omega$ ， ©cum．，but＇in faith，＇as the common principle which bound together and hal－ lowed their common love．From the concluding words，$\dot{\eta} \chi$ d́pts $\mu \in \tau \grave{\alpha} \pi$ ad́vt $\omega v$ $\tau_{\mu} \mu \bar{\omega} \nu(\mathrm{Col} . \mathrm{iv} .18)$ ，there is no reason to infer that the Epistle was intended for the church as well as Titus．It is merely an inclusive benediction that compre－ hends the eniokootos，and those commit－ ted to his oversight，Titus and all the faithful in Crete．＇A $\mu \grave{\eta} \nu$（Rec，with $D^{3} D^{3} E F G H K L$ ）here，as well as in 1 Tim．vi．21， 2 Tim．iv．22，seems an in－ terpolation，though in this case supported by stronger external evidence．It is bracketed by Lachmann，and is rejected by Griesbach，Scholz，Tischendorf，with $\mathrm{ACD}^{1}$ ： 17 ；Clarom．，Ath．－Pol．；Hier．， Ambrst．
In the conclusion of all St．Paul＇s Epistles，except Rom．（om．only by 1 ms．，and Am．），Gal．（om．G，Boern．， Ambrst．），there are similar variations． Accidental omission seems less proba－ ble than insertion．

## TRANSLATION.

## NOTICE.

The same principles are observed in this translation as in those of the Galatians and Ephesians. The Authorized Version is only altered where it appears to be incorrect, inexact, insufficient, or obsctre. There are however a few cases in which I have ventured to introduce another correction - viz., where our renerable Version seems to be inconsistent in its renderings of important or less usual words and forms of expression. These peculiarly occur in this group of Epistles, and the process of translation has made me feel the necessity of preserving a certain degree of uniformity in the meanings assigned to some of the unusual yet recurrent terms and expressions.

This modification has been introduced with great caution, for, as the reader is probably aware, our last Translators state very explicitly that they have not sought to preserve a studied uniformity of translation, and have not always thought it necessary to assign to the same word, even in rery similar combinations, the same meaning. To affect then a rigorous uniformity would be to reverse the principles on which that Version was constructed, and would not be revision but reconstruction. I have trusted then to my own judgment; where it has seemed neeessary to be uniform, I have been so; where this necessity has not been apparent, I have not ventured to interfere with the felicitous variety of expression which characterizes our admirable Version. Whether in a new translation some few general rules and principles might not be thought desirable is fairly open to discussion ; in a revision of an old translation, howerer, such rules can only be laxly observed, and must yield to individual judgment and be modified by the characteristics of the original. I dare not hope to have been alway's consistent, but I have striven to be cautious and circumspect, and I trust I may not be found too often to have been arbitrary or capricious.

The notes will be found a little fuller, as I have been assured by several friends that a greater interest is felt in the collations of the older Version:s than I could have at all expected. These Tersions are exactly the same as those in the previous epistles, and are detailed in the Notice to the Translation of the Galatians.

## TIIE FIRST EPISTLE T0 TLMOTIIY．

## CHAPTER I．

PAUL，an apostle of Christ Jesus，according to the command－ ment of God our Saviour and Christ Jesus our Hope，${ }^{2}$ unto Timothy，my true child in the faith．Grace，mercy，and peace， from God the Father and Christ Jesus our Lord．

3 Even as I besought thee to abide still at Ephesus，when I was on my way into Macedonia，that thou mightest command some not

1．Christ Jesus］＊＇Jesus Christ，＇Auth． According to］So Rhem．，Cov．（both），and Auth．Rom．xvi．26，and Tit．i．3：‘by the，＇Auth．，Wicl．and remaining Vv． Christ Jests］＊＇Lord J．C．，＇Auth．The translation of èmıтaү̀̀⿱亠乂 adopted by Cran．， Gen．，Bish．，＇commission，＇deserves at－ tention ；but，perhaps，too much obseures the idea of the divine ordinance and com－ mand under which the apostle acted； comp．Acts ix．16，$\langle\sigma \alpha \delta \bar{\delta} \boldsymbol{i}$ к．$\tau$. ． ．，and 1 Cor．ix． 15.

It may be re－ membered too that＇command＇origi－ mally seems to have meant＇power＇or authority，Synon．，ed．by Whately，p．91． Our Hope］So Wicl．，Rhem．，Cov．（Test．）： Auth．prefixes＇which is＇with remaining $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$ ．

2．True child］＇My own son，＇Auth．； ＇beloved sone，＇Wicl．，Rhem．，Cov． （Test．）；＇naturall sonne，＇Tynd．，Cov．， Cran．，Gen．，Bish．It seems desirable to retain the more literal translation of $\tau$ éc－ $\nu o \nu$ wherever it does not seem at variance
with our ordinary or idiomatic mode of expression（e．g．ver．18）：the distinc－ tion between Tékyov and viòs is occasion－ ally of considerable importance．
The Father］＊＇Our Father，＇Auth．
Christ Jesus］＇Jesus Christ，＇Auth．，al．， though doubtful on the authority of what edition．

3．Even as］＇As，＇Auth．and the other $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{V}}$ Was on my way］＇Went，＇ Auth．，Wicl．，Cov．（Test．），Rhem．；＇de－ parted，＇Tynd．and remaining $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$ ．
Command］So Tynd．，Cov．，Cran．，Gen．， Bish．，and by far the most usual transla－ tien of the word elsewhere in Auth．： ＇charge，＇Auth．；＇denounse，＇Wicl．， Rhem．；＇warne，＇Cov．（Test．）．The full authoritative meaning of the word should not be here impaired in translation ；see notes．Not to be teachers，etr．．］ ＇That they teach no，＇Auth．，and sim． the other Vv．except Cran．，＇folowe no straunge，etc．；＇Cor．（Test．），＇preache． none otherwyse．＇
to be teachers of other doctrine, ${ }^{4}$ nor yet to give heed to fables and endless genealogies, seeing they minister questions rather than God's dispensation, which is in faith,- so I do now. ${ }^{5}$ But the end of the commandment is love out of a pure heart, and a good conscience, and unfeigned faith: ${ }^{6}$ from which some having gone wide in aim have turned themselves aside unto vain babbling; 7 willing to be teachers of the law ; yet not understanding either
4. Nor yet) 'Neither,' Auth. and all Vv. except Rhem., 'nor.' 'This is perhaps a case where it may seem necessary to adopt a more rigorous translation of $\mu \eta \delta$ é: where the things prohibited are not very different in their character, the ordinary translation will perhaps be sufficiently exact; here, however, the $\tau$ tues are not merely to abstain from teaching others such profitless subjects, but are themselves not to study them. On the full force of oùò or $\mu \eta$ ò $\mathfrak{\epsilon}$ after ov̀ and $\mu \mu^{\prime}$, see Franke's very good treatise de Purl. Neg. II. 5, and illustrate his remark, that ov̀ $\delta \in$ hints at an indefinite number of consequent terms, by Judges i. 27 , where où is followed by fourteen clauses with oìठढ́. To give] 'give,' Auth. Seeing they] 'which,' Auth. and all Vv. God's dispensation] 'Godly edifying,' Auth. and the other Vy. except Wicl., 'edificacioun of God,' and sim. Rhem., Cou. (Test.). 1 do now] 'I do,' Auth.
5. But] So Bish., Rhen.: 'now,' Auth.; 'for,' Wicl. and remaining $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$. Love] So all Vv. except Wicl., Coverd. (Test.), Rhem., and Auth. It is curirious why this change was made, except for variation from ver. 14 ; comp. Vulg. Our last translators were by no means uniform in their translation of $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \dot{d} \pi \eta$ : even in enses where it is associated with riovis and they might have wished to have marked a quasi-theological meaning, it is not uncommonly translated love; compare ch. vi. 11, 1 Thess. iii. 6, al.

Unfeigned faith] 'Faith unfeigned,' Auth. Slight change to preserve the unemphatic order of the Greek;
see Winer, Gr. § 59. 2. English usage is here just the reverse of the Greek.
6. Gone wide in aim] 'Swerved,' Auth.; 'have erred,' Wicl. and the other $V_{y}$. except Coverd. (Test.), 'errynge;' Bisth., 'having erred ;' Rhem., 'straying.' It seems clear our translators made the change from a desire to preserve the proper construct. of à $\sigma$ ( $\chi$ Xeiv with a gen.; and yet not, as $C o v$. ('Test.), to fall into barbarous English, or as Wicl., al., to change the part. into a finite verb, - an inexactness which Conyb. has not avoided. 'To 'go wide from,' is according to the exx. in Johnson s. v. 'wide,' perfectly correct.
Turned themselves] 'Turned,' Auth. and the other Vv, except Wicl., Cov. (Test.), Rhem., 'are turned:' it is perhaps desirable to retain here the medial force of the passive form $\begin{aligned} & \xi \xi \epsilon \tau \rho d \pi \eta \sigma a \nu .\end{aligned}$
Babbling] 'Jangling,' Auth. and all Vr. except Wicl., 'speche ;' Rhem., 'talke.' The change seems required, as 'jangling' might be understood in its secondary sense. It is found in Gower, Chaucer, al,, as here, in the sense of 'prating,' 'idly talking.'
7. Willing] So Wicl., Cov, (both): 'desiring,' Auth.; 'they wolde be,' Tynd., Cran., Gen.; 'covetyng,' Bish.; 'desirous,' Rhem. Though it is not always possible in the N. T. to keep up the exact distinction between $\mathfrak{s} \epsilon$ ' $\lambda \omega$ and Boú$\lambda$ oual. (see notes on ch. ii. 8, and v. 14), this perhaps is a case where it may be maintained: the fulse teachers were quite willing to undertake the office, though they had really no claims.
what they say, or about what they make asseveration. $8^{8}$ Now we know that the law is good, if a man use it lawfully, ${ }^{9}$ knowing this, that the law is not made for a righteous man, but for the lawless and unruly, for the ungodly and sinful, for the unholy and profane, for smiters of fathers and smiters of mothers, for manslayers, ${ }^{10}$ for whoremongers, for them that clefile themselves with mankind, for menstealers, for liars, for perjured persons, and if there be any other thing that is contrary to the sound doctrine, ${ }^{11}$ according to the Gospel of the glory of the blessed God, which was committed to my trust.
${ }^{12}$ And I thank him who gave me inward strength, Christ Jesus our Lord, that IIe counted me faithful, having appointed me for the ministry, ${ }^{13}$ though formerly I was a blasphemer, and a persecutor, and a doer of outrage : still I obtained merey, because I did it ignorantly in unbelief, ${ }^{14}$ yea the grace of our Lord was exceed-
not underst.] Sim. Tynd., Cran., Gen., 'and yet understonde not:' Auth., Cov. (Test.), Bish., Rhem., 'not understanding.' . Either-or] 'Neither - nor,' Auth. etc.] 'Whereof they affirm,' Auth. and all Vv. except Wicl., 'of what thing is ;' ' of what,' Rhem.
8. Now] 'But,' Auth., Cov. (both), Bish.. Rhem.; other Vv. omit except Wicl., 'and.'
9. Unruly] So Auth. in Tit. i. 6, 10, but here 'disobedient,' with Tynd. and all Vv. except Wicl., 'not suget.'
Sinful] 'For sinners,' Auth. and all Vv. (some 'to,' instead of 'for') : perhaps it is a little more exact to retain the adjective. For the unholy] 'For unholy,' Auth.: the idiomatic English article is repeated for the sake of consistency. Siniters (bis)] 'Murderers' (bis), Auth. and all Vv. except Wicl., Cov. (Test.), sleers;' Rhem., 'killers.'
10. The sound doctrine] Auth. omits the arto with Tynd., Cov. (Test.), Gen., Bish, Rhem.; the remaining ,Vv. (Wicl., Cov., Cran.) properly insert it.
11. Gospel of the glory\} So rightly all the Vv. (Bish., 'of glory'), except Auth., Gen., 'glorious gospel.'
12. Him who, etc.] Similarly as to order Gen., Rhem., and it may be added, Syr. and Vulg., rightly preserving the more emphatic position: 'C.J. our Lord who hath enabled me,' Auth., and sim. remaining Vv., except with variations in the translation of $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \delta \nu \nu$, e. g. 'hath made me strong,' Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen., Bish.; 'strengthened,' Rhem.
Thut] 'For that,' Auth.
Having appointed, etc.] 'Putting me into,' Auth., Bish., and similarly the other Vv.
13. Though formerly] * 'Who was before,' Auth. $\quad A$ doer of outrage] Sim. Cov. (Test.), 'docr of injury :' 'injurious,' $\Delta u t h . ; ~ ' f u l ~ o f ~ w r o n g i s, ' ~ W i c l . ; ~$ 'tyraunt,' Tynd., Cov., Cran.; 'oppressor,' Gen., Bish.; 'contumelious,' Rhem. Still] 'But,' Auth. and all Vv. except Bish., 'but yet.'
14. Yea]. 'and,' Auth., Rhem.; 'but,' Wicl., Cov. (Test.) ; 'neverthelater,' Tynd.; 'nevertheless,' Coverd., Cran., Bish.; 'yet,' Gen.
15. Faithful is, etc.] 'This is a faithful
ing abundant with faith and love which is in Christ Jesus. ${ }^{15}$ Faithful is the saying, and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners ; of whom I am chief. ${ }^{16}$ Howbeit for this cause I obtained mercy, that in me as chief Christ Jesus might show forth the whole of His long-suffering, to display a pattern for them which should hereafter believe on IIm unto eternal life. ${ }^{17}$ Now unto the King of ages, the immortal, invisible, only God, be honor and glory forever and ever. Amen.
${ }^{18}$ This charge I commit unto thee, son Timothy, in accordance with the forerunning prophecies about thee, that thou mayest war in them the good warfare; ${ }^{19}$ having faith, and a good conscience ; which some having thrust away, have made shipwreck concerning the faith: ${ }^{20}$ of whom is Hymeneus and Alexander ; whom I delivered unto Satan, that they might be taught by chastisement not to blaspheme.
saying, Auth., Bish.; 'this is a true s.,' Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen.; 'a trewe word,' Wicl. ; 'a faithful s.,' Rhe:n.
16. As chief] 'First;' Auth. and all Vv. (Bish. inserts art.) except Cov., 'principally,' and Cov. (Test.), which omits the word.
Christ Jesus] * 'J. C.,' Auth.
The whole of ] 'All,' Auth. and all Vv. To display a puttern] Similarly, 'to declare an ensample,' Cran.: 'for a pattern to,' Auth.; 'to enfourmynge of,' Wicl., sim. Cov. (Test.), Rhem.; 'unto the example,' Tynd., Cov. ('to the'), Gen., Bish. (to the).

Unto eternal life] 'To life everlasting,' Auth. It seems best to adopt the order which, properly considered, most exactly corresponds to that of the Greek, and to adopt the most general and inclusive translation of aibvios; see notes on 2 Thess. i. 9 (Transl.).
17. Of ages] Simil., ' of the worldes,' Wicl. (omits art.), Rhem.: 'eternal,' Auth. ; ' everlastyng,' Tynd., and remaining Vv.

The immortal, etc.]
' Immortal, invisible, the only * wise God,' Auth.
18. In accordunce with, etc.] 'According to the prophecies which went before on thee,' Author., Bish., and similarly Wicl., Rhem. ; 'proph., which in tyme past were prophesied of the,' Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gien.

Mayest war] 'By them mightest war,' Auth. ; 'shuldest, ctc.' Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen., Bish. Change necessary to preserve the law of the succession of tenses; see Latham, Eng. Lang. § $616 . \quad$ In them] So all Vr. except Auth., which changes (not for the better) the $\epsilon \nu$ into 'by ;' see notes. The good] 'A good,' Auth. and all other Vv.
19. Having] So Wicl. and all Vv. except $\Lambda u t h$, which adopts 'holding.'
Thrust] 'Put,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Wicl., 'resten aweie;' Rhem., 'repelling.' The fuith] So Wicl., Rhem.: 'faith,' Auth. and remaining $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$. When the article is inserted after a preposition, it should never be overlooked in translation, if the English idiom will permit it to be expressed.
20. Delivered] 'Have delivered,' Auth. and all Vv. except Wicl., 'I betook,' where the aoristic form is maintained as

## CHAPTER II.

## I exhort then first of all, that petitions, prayers, supplications,

 and giving of thanks, be made for all men; ${ }^{2}$ for kings, and all that are in authority ; that we may pass a quiet and tranquil lifein the Greck. There are cases where the idiom of our language may seem positively violated by an aoristic translation, especially in cases where $\nu \hat{v} \nu$ or $\eta \tilde{\eta} \delta \eta$ is found with the aor. ; these are, however, cases in which we do not rashly assert that the aor. is used for the perf., but in which wo only recognize an idiomatic power in the Greek aorist which does not exist in our English past tense. Where idiom requires us to insert 'have' (as perhaps just above, ver. 19), it must be inserted; but these cases are fewer than modern translators seem generally aware of.

Might be taught, etc.] 'May learn,' Auth., and sim. all Vv. except Tynd., 'be taught.' The addition 'by chastisement,' is necessary to convey the true meaning of $\pi \alpha \iota \delta \in \dot{v} \omega$.

Chapter II. 1. Then] 'Therefore,' Auth. and all Vv. On this particle see notes in loc. It may be observed that, as a very general rule, it is better to translate oũv 'then,' ápa 'therefore,' or, at any rate, if 'therefore' be retained as a translation of the former particle, to place it as far onward in the clause as idiom will permit, so as to weaken its full illative force. The present seems an instance where the more exact distinction (see notes on Gal. iii. 5) ought to be preserved ; still it is not wise in the $N$. T. generally to press this rule too rigorously, as in many cases the context and in many more the usus scribendi of the sacred author must be allowed to have lue weight in fixing on the translation. For example, St. John's use of oû̀ appears to deserve considerable attention,
especially, too, as he never uses ápa; and even St. Paul, it should be remembered, uses ô̂v, on an average, four times more than he does ápa. A really faithful transIntion must take all these things into account. First] 'That first,' Auth. and all Vv. except Wich., Coverd. (Test.), Cran., which adopt the order of text. Petitions, prayers, etc.] 'Supplications, prayers, intercessions,' - Auth., Gen.; 'prayers, supplications, intercessions,' Tynd., Cov., Cran., Bish.; 'besechingis, preiers, axyngis,' Wicl.; ' earnest desires, praiers, requestes,' Cor. (Test.) ; 'obsecrations, praiers, postulations,' Rhem. 'Supplication' is by no means a bad translation for $\delta \in \hat{\jmath} \sigma$. (Eph. vi, 18) ; but as this is a technical passage, it seems more suitable to reserve it for $\mathfrak{e} \nu \tau \tau \dot{\jmath} \xi \in t s$; see notes.
2. Pass] 'Lead,' Auth.: slight change, but perhaps better maintaining the mixed subjective and objective ref. of the clause ; compare notes in loc.
Quiet and tranquil] 'quiet and peaceable,' Auth. and all other Vv. Perhaps 'tranquil' expresses the idea of the rest 'arising from within' (see notes) a little more fully than 'peaceable;' compare 1 Pet. iii. $4 . \quad$ Gravity] 'Honesty,' Auth. and all Vr. except Wicl., Coverd. (Test.), Rhem., 'chastity.' In the preceding word, $\epsilon \dot{v} \sigma \in \in \in \in a$, the transl. of $A u t h$. has been retained, Though 'godliness' is more exactly $\underset{\text { st } \notin \sigma \in ́ \beta \text {., yet it is used in all }}{ }$ the older Vr. (except only Wicl., Rhem., 'piety') as the translation of $\epsilon \dot{v} \sigma \epsilon$ ' $\beta$., and seems fairly to suit all the passages where it occurs. The deviation of $A u t h$, in Acts iii. 11 is not for the better.
in all godliness and gravity. ${ }^{3}$ For this is good and acceptable is the sight of our Saviour God; ${ }^{4}$ whose will is that all men should be saved, and should come unto the full knowledge of the truth. ${ }^{5}$ For there is one God and one mediator also between God and men, a man Christ Jesus ; ${ }^{6}$ who gave Himself a ransom for all, the testimony to be set forth in its own seasons. 7 Whercunto I was appointed a herald, and an apostle (I speak the truth, I lie not), a teacher of the Gentiles in faith and verity.
${ }^{8}$ I desire then that men pray in every place, lifting up holy hands, without wrath and doubting: ${ }^{9}$ likewise that women
3. Our Saviour God] So Cov. (Test.), Rhem.: 'God our Sav.,' Auth, and the remaining $\mathrm{Vv}_{\mathrm{v}}$.
4. Whose will is, etc.] 'Who will have,' Auth. and all Vv. except Wicl., 'that wole,' and sim. Cov. (Test.), Rhem. The translation of Scholef., 'who willeth,' is perhaps rather too strong.
Should be] 'To be,' Auth.
Should come] 'To come,' Auth. The full knowledge] 'The knowledge,' Auth. and all Vv . except Wicl. 'the knowynge.'
5. And one med. also] Sim. Rhem., 'one also med.:' Auth, and all other Vv. (except Wicl., here erroneous), 'and one med.' 'The addition of 'and' in italics seems required by our idiom: indeed we may perhaps sometimes rightly say that the Greek кal is occasionally in itself almost equivalent to our 'and - also.'
A man] So Wicl.; 'man,' Rhem. : Auth. and remaining $\mathrm{Vv}_{\text {., ' }}$ the man.?
6. The testimony, etc.] 'To be testified in due time,' Auth., and sim. Tynd., Cran., Cov. (' be preached'). The true construction appears to have been observed in Gen., ' which is that testimonie appointed at,' and perhaps Bish., ' $a$ testimony in due tymes.' All the $\mathrm{Vv}_{\text {. }}$, except Auth., Bish., retain a more literal transl. of 合铞, 'his tymes.'
7. Was] 'Am,' Auth: and all Vv. Appointed] Rhem., and so Auth. in 2

Tim. i. 11. Auth. and all other Vv., except Wicl. ('sette'), 'have ordained.' I'ruth] 'Truth* in Christ,' Auth.
8. Desire then] 'Will therefore,' Auth. and all Vv . In every place] So Cov. (Test.), Rhem.: 'everywhere,' Auth. and remaining Vv. except Wicl., 'in al place.'
9. Likewise, etc.] So Tynd., Coverd. (both), Cran., Gen., Bish., except that they insert 'also' immediately afterwards: 'in like manner also,' Auth.
In modest guise] 'Adorn themselves in modest apparel,' $\Delta u t h$. ; ' that they araye themselves in comely app.,' Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen., Bish.
Shamefustness] So Auth. in the original edition, following Wicl., Tynd., Coverd., Cran., etc.: we may agree with Dean Trench (Synonyms, p. 78) in regretting that this spelling has been displaced in the modern editions for 'shamefaced: ness,' a word in which the true etymology is perverted.

Sobermindedness] 'Sobriety,' Auth., Rhem.; 'sobirnesse,' Wicl., Cov. (Test.); 'discrete behaviour,' Tynd., Cov., Cran., Bish.; 'modestie,' Gen. It is very difficult to select a translation for $\sigma \omega \phi$ poróvŋ. Our choice seems to lie between 'sobermindeduess ' and discretion;' the latter, more especially in the adjective (sec two pertinent examples in Richardson, Dict. s. v., from Chaucer, Persones Tale, and Milton,
also, in modest guise, with shamefastness and sobermindedness, to adorn themselves,-not with braided hair and gold, or pearls, or costly apparel, ${ }^{10}$ but (which becometh women professing godliness) through good works.
${ }^{11}$ Let the woman learn in silence with all subjection. ${ }^{12}$ But I suffer not the woman to TEACH, nor yet to have authority over the man, but to be in silence. ${ }^{13}$ For Adam was first formed, then Eve. ${ }^{14}$ And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being plainly deceived fell into transgression. ${ }^{15}$ Tet she shall be saved by means of THE childbearing, if they continue in faith and love and holiness with sobermindedness.

## CHAPTER III.

Faithful is the saying, If a man desire the office of a bishop, he desireth a good work. ${ }^{2}$ A bishop then must be irreproachable,

Par. Rey. Book ir.), is very suitable in ref. to women (and is so used by Tynd., Cov., Cran., in ver. 15), but the former scems best to preserve the etymology of the original word.
Braided] So Tynd. ('broyded') and the other Vv. except Auth., 'broidered' (not a felicitous correction); Wicl., 'writhun ;' Rhem., 'plaited.'
And] *' Or,' Auth. Apparel] So Rhem. : 'array' $\mathbf{A u t h}$. and other Vv . except Wicl. and Cov. (Test.), ' precious cloth.'
10. Through] So Tynd., Cov. (both), Cran., Bish.: ' with,' Auth., Gen.; 'bi,' Wicl., Rhem.
12. The woman] 'A woman,' Auth. The insertion of the article seems required by our idiom, as in ver. 11 : see notes in loc. Nor yet] 'Nor,' Auth. As the command seems to have also a general reference (see notes), it is perhaps better to be exact in ovió $\dot{\text {; }}$ see notes on ch. i. 4 (Transl.).
auth.] So Tynd., Cov, : ' usurp authority,' Auth., Cranm., Gen., Bish., Wicl., 'have lordschip;' Cov. (Test.), 'use authority;' Rhem., 'have dominion.'
14. Plainly 'ileceived] *'Deceived,'

Auth. Fell into] ! Was in the,' Auth., Cov. (Test.), Bish., and sim. Tynd. ; 'in bevekinge of the lawe,' Wicl.; 'brought in the,' Cov.; 'subdued to the,' Cranm.; 'was made giltie of,' Gen.; 'was in prevarication,' Rhem.
15. Yet] So Rhem.: 'notwithstanding,' Auth. and the other $V_{V}$. except Wicl., Cov. (Test.), 'but.'
By means of T'HE childbearing] 'In childbearing,' Auth.; ' bi generacioun,' Wicl., Rhem.; ' thorowe bearinge of ch.,' $T_{y n n d}$. and remaining Vr. except Cov. (Test.), ' by engendrynge of.'

Love]
So all Vr. except Auth., 'charity,' see notes on ch. i. 5 (Transl.)
Sobermindedness] 'Sobriety,' Auth.; see notes on ver. 9 (Transl.).

Ceapter III. 1. Faithful is the saying] 'This is a true saying,' Auth., Tynd., Cov., Crun., Gen. ; 'this is a faithful s.,' Bish., sim. Cov. (Test.).
2. Irreproachable] Similarly Wicl., 'without repreef:' 'blameless,' Auth., Cov., Cran., Bish.; 'fautlesse,' Tynd., Gen.; 'unrebukeable,' Cov. (Test.) ; 'irreprehensille,' Rhem. If the definition
a husband of one wife, sober, sobermindech, discreet, orderly, a lover of hospitality, apt to teach; ${ }^{3}$ not fierce over wine, no striker, but forlearing, averse to contention, not a lover of money, 4 one that ruleth well his own house, having lis children in subjection with all gravity; ${ }^{5}$ (But if a man know not how to rule his own house, how shall he take care of the church of God ?) ${ }^{6}$ not a new convert, lest being besotted with pride he fall into the judgment of the devil. 7 Moreover he must have a good report also from them which are without, lest he fall into reproach and the snare of the devil.
${ }^{8}$ Deacons in like manner must be grave, not double-tongued, not
of Webster (Dict.) is right, 'irreproachable $=$ that cannot be justly reproached,' this seems the translation needed; see notes in loc. husband,' Auth. $A$ husband] 'The

Sober, soberminded] ' Vigilant, sober,' Auth.; 'sobre, prudent,' Wicl.; ' sober, wyse,' Coverd. (Test.), Rhem. ; ' sober, distrete,' Tynd., Cov.; ' diligent, sober,' Cran.; 'watehing, sober,' Gen., Bish. If there be any objection to this juxtaposition, we may adopt Tynd.; the transl. in text has, however, this advantage, that it implies that $\nu \eta \phi \dot{\alpha} \lambda t o \nu$ is not taken metaphorically; see notes.

Orderly]
'Of good behavier,' Auth.; 'honestly appareled,' Tynd., sim. Bish.; 'manerly,' Cov. (both); 'discrete,' Cranm.; ' modest,' Gen.; 'comely,' Rheni.
A lover of hosp.] So Bish., and also Auth. in Tit. i. 8: 'given to hospitality,' Auth. (here) ; 'holdynge hosp.,' Wicl. ; 'harberous,' - a noticeable transl., Tynd., Cov. (both), Gen.; 'a man of hosp.,' Rhem.
3. Fierce over wine] 'Given to wine,' Auth., Wicl. and sim. other $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$. except Tynd., 'drunken;' Coverd. (Test.), 'a dronkharde.' The marginal note shows that our last translators saw correctly the meaning of the word, though they have not expressed it.
But, etc.] Auth. prefixes *' not greedy of filthy luce.'

Forbeuring]
'Patient,' Auth.; 'temperate,' Wicl.; 'gentle,' Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen., Bish.; 'styll,' Cov. (Test.) ; 'modest,' Rhem. Averse to contention] So Tit. iii. 2: ' not a brawler,' Auth.; 'not ful of chidynge,' Wiclif; 'abhorring fightynge,' Tynd.,' Cran., Gen., Bish., and sim. Cov. ('abh. stryfe' '). A lover of money] ' Covetous,' Auth., and sim. all other Vv. It is better to keep 'covetous' for $\pi \lambda \in \propto \nu$ '́клクラs.
4. His] Auth. not in italics.
5. But] So Cov. (both), Rhem.: 'for,' Auth. and the other Vv .
6. New convert] Sim. Wicl., 'newe conuerted to the feith:' ' novice,' Auth.; 'young skoler,' Tynd., Cov., Cran. Gen., Bish. ; 'neophyte,' Rhem.
Besotted with ] 'Lifted up with,' Auth.; 'he swel,' Tynd., Cran., Gen.; 'be puft up,' Cov., Bish. The idea of a stupid, insensate pride ought to be conveyed in translation ; see notes.
Judgnent $]$ So Tynd., Cov. (both), Cran., Rhem.: 'condennation,' Auth., Genev., Bish.; 'dome,' Wicl.
7. Also from] 'of,' Auth.; the word 'moreover,' Auth., may be properly assigned to $\delta \dot{\epsilon}$, which, as has been observed several times in the notes (comp. on ver. 10 ), often appears to revert to its primary meaning.
8. Deacons, etc.] Similarly Rhem.: 'likewise must the deacons be,' Author.;
given to much wine, not grecdy of filthy lucre ; 9 holding the mystory of the faith in a pure conscience. ${ }^{10}$ And let these also first be proved; then let them serve as deacons, if they be under no charge. ${ }^{11}$ The women in like manner must be grave, not slanderers, sober, faithful in all things. ${ }^{12}$ Let the deacons be the husbands of one wife, ruling their children well and their own houses. ${ }^{13}$ For they that have served well as deacons obtain for themselves a good degree, and great boldness in the faith which is in Christ Jesus.
${ }^{14}$ These things write I unto thee, though I hope to come unto thee somerrhat quickly; ${ }^{15}$ but if I should tarry long, that thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God, which truly is the church of the living God, the pillar and basis of the truth. ${ }^{16}$ And confessedly great is the mystery of god-
'mynisters,' Cov. (both), Cran., Bish. ; the rest, 'deacons,' either with (Tynd.) or without ( Wicl., Gen.) the article. The transl. of aio $\chi \rho о к \in \rho \delta \in i$ is is retained as being that of all the Vv., except Wicl.
10. If they be, etc.] Similarly Cov., 'if they be blameless :' 'being found blameless,' Auth.; 'if they be found,' etc., Tynd., Gen. ; 'being bl.,' Bish. ; 'having no crime,' Rhem. Serve as deacons] 'Use the office of a deacon,' Auth. This periphrasis mightbe avoidcd by ' minister,' asin all the other Vv.; we seem, however, to require in ver. 13 an allusion to the office 'nominatim.'
11. The women, etc.] Sim. Wicl., Rhem., Cov. (Test.), after Vulg. : 'even so must their wives be,' Auth. and all the remaining Vv.
12. Well] So, in the same place, all $V_{\mathrm{v} .}$ : Auth. places the adverb at the end of the verse. Where there is no liability to mistake, it seems better to keep, as far as possible, the order of the Greek
13. Served well as, etc.] :Used the office of a deacon well,' Auth.
Obtain for] 'Purchase to themselves,' Auth., Rhem.; 'get themselves,' Tynd. and all the remaining Vv .
14. Though I hope] 'Hoping,' Auth., and similarly all other $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$.
Somewhat quickly] 'Shortly,' Auth., Tynd., Cov. (both), Cran., Gen., Bish.; 'very shortly,' Gen.; 'quickly,' Rhem.
15. Should tarry] 'Tarry,' Auth., and all Vv. Which truly]
'Which,' Auth. and all other Vv. except Wicl., 'that is.'
16. Confersedly] 'Without controversy,' Auth.; ' without naye,' Tynd., Cov. (both), Gen.; 'without doute,' Cranm., Bish. Who] * 'God,' 'Auth. Was manifested] So Rhem.: ' was manifest,' Auth. ; 'shewed,' Wicl. and remaining Vv.

We may here briefly remark that the six concluding clauses of this verse may be arranged stichometrically in the following way:-




 ${ }^{2} A \nu \in \lambda \eta \mu \varphi \uparrow \eta$ èv $\delta \delta \xi \xi \eta$.

Without urging too strongly the metrical character of the clauses, it would still
liness ; "Who was manifested in the flesh, justified in the spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory."

## CHAPTER IV.

Howbert the Spirit saith expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils, 2 through the hypocrisy of speakers of lies, men bearing a brand on their own conscience, ${ }^{3}$ forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats, which God created for them that believe and have full knowledge of the truth to partake of with thanksgiving. ${ }^{4}$ For every creature of God is good, and
scem that the supposition advanced in notes in loc. does not appear wholly without plausibility. Alford (in loc.) objects to this view, but appears clearly to lean to it in his note on 2 Tim. ii. 11.

Chapter IV. 1. Howbeit $]$ Similarly Wicl., Cov. (Test.), 'but:' see notes; - 'now,' Auth., Bish.; the remaining Vv. omit. Saith] So Wicl., Cov. (Test.), Rhemr.: 'speaketh,' Auth. and the other $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{V}}$. All the $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{V}}$. except Rhem. preserve the order of verb and adverb adopted in the text, and apparently correetly; the slight emphasis is thus retained on $\dot{\rho} \eta \tau \bar{\omega}$ s: comp. notes on 2 Thess. iii. 8. Depart] So Auth. and all Vv.
2. Through the hyp., etc.] Similarly as to èv úmosp., Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gien., 'which speak false thorow hyp.;' $\psi$ evסod. is, however, by some (Wicl. and appy. Gen.) referred to $\delta a u \mu 0 \nu i \omega v:$ Auth., 'speaking lies in hypc,' is ambiguous. The above, it must be said, is a somewhat lax translation of e $\mathrm{E} \boldsymbol{\nu} ;$ it seems, however, positively required by the idiom of our language. Whether we con-
 $\sigma_{\epsilon} \notin \nu=\epsilon \tau$, it seems scarcely English to say 'by the hypocrisy.'

Men bearing, etc.] 'Having their conscience seared with a hot iron,' Auth., and similarly all Vv. except Wicl., 'have their conscience corrupt,' and Rhem., which omits 'hot iron.' The insertion of men in the text seems to make the construction a little more clear.
3. Created] So Rhem., similarly Wicl., 'made :' 'hath created,' Auth. and all other $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$. For them that, etc. 'To be received with thanksgiving of them,' Auth., and similarly all other Vv. except Wicl. ' with doyinge of thankis to,' and Rhem., which mainly accords with text, 'to receane with thankes-giving for the faithful and them that have knowen,' etc. It is very difficult to preserve both the correct translation of the words and the order of the original ; the latter must apparently here be sacrificed.
Have full knowledge] ' Know,' Auth. and all other Vv. except Wicl., Cov. (Test.), Phem., which expresses the perf. 'have known,' Vulgate 'cognoverunt.' The transl. of $\pi$ toroîs is perhaps not perfectly satisfactory, but any change will involve an insertion of the article before the next words, which is certainly very undesirable ; see notes.
4. Is to bel So Wicl., Cov. (Test.),
nothing is to be refused, if it be received with thanksgiving; 5 for it is sanctified by the word of God and supplication.
${ }^{6}$ If thou settest forth these things to the brethren, thou wilt be a good minister of Christ Jesus, being nourished up in the words of faith and of the good doctrine, of which thou hast been a disciple. ${ }^{7}$ But eschew profane and old-wives' fables ; and exercise thyself rather unto godliness. ${ }^{8}$ For the exercise of the body is profitable unto a little, but godliness is profitable unto all things, as it hath a promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come. ${ }^{9}$ Faithful is the saying and worthy of all acceptation. ${ }^{10}$ For
and similarly Gen., 'oght to be :' simply ' to be,' Auth. and the other Vv.
5. Supplication] 'Prayer,' Auth. and all $\mathrm{Vv} . ;$ it seems, however, necessary, as ${ }^{\text {en }} \nu \tau \in \nu \xi$ เs occurs only twice in the N. T., here and ch. ii. 1 (see notes in loc.), to mark it by a special and uniform translation.
6. Settest forth] Similarly Wicl., Cov. (Test.), 'puttinge forth,' and Rhem., 'proposing:' Auth. and remaining Vv., 'put the brethren in remembrance of,' which from the examples of $\dot{\operatorname{vinoti}} \mathrm{i} \in \sigma$ Nal $\tau$ tvt cited by Krebs and Locsner (see notes), scems certainly too weak. The translation 'if thou,' ctc. is perhaps not quite so critically correct as 'by setting forth,' etc., or ' in setting forth,' etc. (see notes on ch. iv. 16), but may still be left unchanged, as it cannot be termed definitely inexact.

Wilt be]
'Shalt be,' Auth. and all Vv.
Christ Jesus] * 'Jesus Christ,' Auth.
Being nourished] So Cov. (Test.) : 'nourished,' Auth., Wicl., Rhem. ; 'which hast bene n.,' Tynd. and the remaining Vv.
The good] So Rhem.: 'good,' Auth. and all the other $V \mathrm{~V}$. The article ought, perhaps, also to be inserted before 'faith' ( $\tau \hat{\eta} s \pi i \sigma \tau \epsilon \omega s$ ), but it would tend to give it an objective meaning, which does not seem desirable; see notes.
Of which, etc.] ' Whereunto thou hast attained,' Auth., and sim. Cov. (Test.),

Rhem. ; 'has gete,' Wicl. ; 'which thou hast continually followed,' Tynd., Cran., Gen., Bish.; 'hast folowed hither to,' Cov.
7. Eschew] So Wicl. and Cov. (Test.) : 'refuse,' Auth.; 'avoid,' Rhem.; 'cast away,' Tynd. and the remaining Vr.
Exercise, etc.] So Auth., Tynd. omits both 'and' and 'rather;' Cran., Bish. only the former; Gen. and Rhem. only the latter. The transl. of Cov., ' as for ungoostly and, etc., cast them awaye, but, ctc.,' is good, but in thus preserving the sccond $\delta \epsilon$ it misses the first. The punctuation of Lachm. and Tisch., who place a period after $\pi \alpha \rho a \iota \tau o \hat{v}$, is perhaps not an improvement on the ordinary colon: the antithesis between the two members ought not to bo too much obscured.
8. The exercise, etc.] 'Bodily exercise,' Auth., and similarly all other Vv.: it seems desirable to try to retain the article, 'the bodily exercise these teachers affect to lay such stress upon.'
As it hath] 'Having,' Auth., Cov. (Test.), Bish., Rhemish; 'that hath,' Wiclif; 'which hath,' Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen.
9. Faithful is the] "This is a faithful,' Auth.; 'this is a sure s.,' Tynd., Coverd. (Test. ' faithful '), Cran., Gen.; ' a trewe word, Wicl.; 'a faithful saying,' Rhem.
10. Looking to this ] "Therefore, ${ }^{2}$ Auth. and the other Vv. except Wicl.,
looking to this we both labor and suffer reproach, because we have placed our hope on the living God, who is the Saviour of all men, especially of believers.
${ }^{11}$ These things command and teach. ${ }^{12}$ Let no man despise thy youth; but become an example unto the believers, in word, in conduct, in love, in faith, in purity. ${ }^{13}$ Till I come give attention to the reading, to the exhortation, to the doctrine. ${ }^{14}$ Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee through prophecy with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery. ${ }^{15}$ These things practise, in these things be occupied,-that thy advance may be manifest to all. ${ }^{16}$ Give heed unto thyself and unto the doctrine ; continue in them: for in doing this thou shalt save both thyself and them that hear thee.
' and in this thing ; Rhem., 'to this purpose.' . Have placed, etc.] 'We trust,' Auth.; 'we hopen in,' Wicl., Cov. (both); 'we beleve,' Tynd., Cran.; 'have sure hope in,' Gen. ; 'have hopen in,' Bish.

Believers] As Auth. in ver. 12 : here 'those that believe,' with Tynd., Coverd., Cran., Gen., Bish.; a translation which is perhaps a little too emphatic for the simple anar-
 is by very far the more usual translation in $\Delta u t h$. ; there are cases, however (e.g. ch. v. 16, vi. 2), where perspicuity seems to require the change. It is noticeable, too, that $\pi t \sigma \tau 0$ ( per se, not $̇ \nu \mathrm{X} \rho$. ' $\mathrm{I} \eta \sigma$., Eph. i. 1, etc.) in these Epp. (as our Translators appear to have clearly felt) seems to have become a more definite expression for 'believers,' i. e. Christians, and to have almost displaced of $\pi\llcorner\sigma \tau$ cuov$\tau \in s$, the expression which so greatly predominates in the apostle's earlier Epistles.
12. Become] 'Be thou,' Auth., Wicl., Cov., Bish.; 'be,' Tynd. and remaining Vv. Unto] So Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen.: 'of,' Auth., Wicl., Coverd. (Test.), Rhem., Bish. Conduct] ' Conversation,' Auth. and the other Vv.
except Wicl., 'Iyuynge.' Change made only to obviate a possible misunderstanding owing to the preceding 'word.'
Love] So all Vv. except Auth., Rhem., 'charity;' see notes on ch. i. 5 (Transl.). Auth. inserts * ' in spirit' after 'charity.'
13. Altention] 'Attendance,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Wicl., 'take tent;' 'geuc hede,' Cov. (Test.) ; 'attend unto,' Rhem.

The reading, etc.] Auth. and all VV. omit the articles.
14. Through] So Tynd., Con., Cran., Bish.: 'by,' Auth. and remaining Vv.
15. These things, etc,] Similarly Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen., 'these thynges exercise:' 'meditate upon these things,' Auth.; 'thenke thou these thingis,' Wicl. ; 'think upon,' Coverd. . (Test.) ; 'these doe thou meditate,' Rhem. It seems best here to maintain the order of the original : so also Syr., Vulg.
In these things, etc.] 'Give thyself wholly to them,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Wicl., Rhem., 'be in,' and Cov. (Test.), 'be diligente in,' - a good transl., though perhaps a little more periphrastic than that in the text. To all] So Auth.,- though, as Marg. shows, it read є่ $\pi \hat{\alpha} \sigma เ \nu$.
16. Give] 'Take,' Auth. and the other

## CHAPTER V.

Do not sharply rebuke an elder, but exhort him as a father; the younger men as brethren; ${ }^{2}$ the elder women as mothers; the younger as sisters, in all purity. ${ }^{3}$ Pay due regard to widows that are widows indeed. ${ }^{4}$ If, however, any widow have children or grandchildren, let them learn first to show piety towards their own family, and to requite their parents: for this is acceptable before God. 5 But she that is a widow indeed, and desolate, hath turned her hopes toward God, and abideth in her supplications and her prayers night and day: ${ }^{6}$ but she that liveth riotously is dead while

Vv. except Rhem., 'attend to.'
Save both ${ }^{\text {] So Sov. (Test.), Rhem., and }}$ sim. Wicl.: 'both save,' Auth., Bish.; the remaining $V v$. omit the first kal in translation.

Ciapter V. 1. Do not sharply, etc.] ' Rebuke not,' Auth. and all Vv. except Wicl., ' blame thou not.' 'Reprimand' would perhaps be the most exact translation.

Exhort] So Tynd., Cov., Cran., Ger., Bish.: ' intreat,' Auth.; 'beseche,' Wiel., Rhem. It does not appear clear why the Auth. made this change.
2. In] So Wicl., Cov. (Test.), Bish., Rhem.: ' with,' Auth. and the remaining $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{V}}$. It may be observed that in the original edition of Auth. (so also Wicl., Coo.) there is no comma after sisters ; see notes.
3. Pay due regard] 'Honor', Auth. and all $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$.
4. If, however] 'But if,' Auth., Wicl., Bish., Rhem.; 'and if,' Cov. (Test.); the rest 'if' only.

Have] So Auth. and-all $\nabla_{v}$. exeent Wicl., Cov. (Test.), which, probably following the Latin ' habet,' use the indicative ; so Conyb. in loc. This, however, does not appear critically exact; see Latham, Eng. Lang. § 537 (ed. 4), and compare
notes on 2 Thess. iii. 14. The English and Greek idioms seem here to be different. Grandchildren] 'Nephews,' Auth. and all other $\mathrm{Vv}_{\mathrm{v}}$ except Wicl., 'children of sons ;' Coverdale (Test.), 'chyldes chyldren.' Though archaisms as such are removed from this translation, yet here a change seems desirable, as the use of the antiquated term 'nephews ' (nepotes) is so very likely to be misunderstood. Towards, etc.] 'At home,' Auth.; 'rule their owne houses godly,' Tynd., and sim. the other Vr. This is acceptable] 'That is * good and acceptable,' Auth.
5. But $\rfloor$ So Coo. (both), Rhem., 'now,' Auth.; 'and,' Wicl., Bish.; omitted in Tynd., Cran., Gen.
Hath turned, etc.] 'Trusteth in,' $\Delta u t h$. ; ' putteth her trust in,' Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen. ; 'hopeth in,' Bish. The force of $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \pi i \zeta \omega$ with $\epsilon \pi\rangle$ and the accus. should not be left unnoticed; see notes on ch. iv. 10. Abideth $]$ 'Continueth,' Auth. and all $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$. cexcept Wicl., ' be bisie in.' A somewhat marked translation seems required by $\pi p o \sigma \mu e ́ v e t$ with a dat. Her stppl., etc.] Auth. and all the Vv. leave both articles unnoticed.
6. Liveth riotously] 'Liveth in pleasure,' Auth. and other Vv. except Wicl., ' is lyuynge in delicis;' Cov. (Test.),
she liveth. ${ }^{7}$ And these things command, that they may be irreproachable. ${ }^{8}$ But if any one provide not for his own, and specially for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an unbeliever.
${ }^{9}$ Let no one be placed on the list as a widow under threescore years old, the wife of one husband, ${ }^{10}$ being well reported of in good works; if she ever brought up children, if she entertained strangers, if she washed the saints' feet, if she relieved the afflicted, if she followed after every good work. ${ }^{11}$ But younger widows refuse : for when they have come to wax wanton against Christ their will is to marry; ${ }^{12}$ bearing about a judgment that they broke their first faith. ${ }^{13}$ Moreover they learn withal to be idle, going round
'that hath pleasures;' 'is in delicious. ness,' Rhem.
7. Command] So all Vv. except Auth., 'give in charge.' Irreproachable] 'Blameless,' Auth., Bish., Rhem., sim. Cov., 'without blame,' Cov. ('Test.), 'unblameable;' Wicl., 'without repreef;' Tynd., Genev., 'without faut;' Cramn., 'without rebuke.' See notes on ch. iii. 2 (Transl.).
8. Any one ! 'Any,' Auth.

Unbeliever] 'Infidel,' Auth. and all Vv. except Wicl., 'an unfaithful man.'
9. Let no one, etc.] 'Let not a widow be taken into the number,' Auth.; somewhat similarly to text, Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen., 'let no widow be chosen ;' except that they appear to miss the fact that $\chi$ ńpa is a predicate. Ola] So Auth., Tynd., Cov., Cran., Bish.; the archaism is not changed, being perfectly intelligible.

The wife]
'.Having been the w.,' Auth., Bish.; ' as was,' etc., Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen.
Husband] So Wicl., Cov. (Test.) : 'man,' Auth. and the other. Vv.
10. In] So all the $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{V}}$. except Auth., 'for.'

Ever brought up]
'Have brought up,' Auth.; change only made to endeavor to preserve the force of the aorist. Wicl. alone omits the 'have.'

Entertuined] 'Have
lodged,' Auth., Cran., Bish., and simil. Cov. (Test.); 'bene liberall to,' Tynd., (Xen. ; 'bene harberous,' Cov., sim. Wicl., 'resceyued to herborwe.'
Washed] 'Have washed,' Auth. Relieved] 'Have relieved,' $A u t h$. Followod afler] Similarly Wicl., Rhem., 'folowid,' Cozerd. (Test.), 'followed upon:' 'diligently followed,' Author.; 'continually given unto,' Tynd. and remaining Vr .
11. Younger] So Wicl.: 'the younger,' Auth. and all the other $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$.
Have come, etc.] 'Have begun,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Wicl., 'han done lecheri; ' Cov. (Test.), 'are waxen wanton ;' Rhem., 'shall be w.'
Their will is, etc.] 'they will marry,' Auith. and all Vv. except Wicl., 'wolen be wedded.' Change to prevent a confusion with the simple future; see notes.
12. Bearing about, etc.] 'Having damnation,' Auth. and all Vv.
That] 'Because,' Auth. and all Vv.
Broke] Similarly Tynd., Coverd., Gen., 'have broken:' 'they have cast off,' Auth., sim. Cov. (Test.), Cran., Bish.; 'han made void,' Wicl., Rhem.
13. Moreover] 'And withal they learn,' Auth. Going round] Simi-
larly (though not in respect of construction) Tynd., Cian., Gen., 'learn to gon
from house to house ; and not only idle, but tattlers also and busybodies, speaking things which they ought not. ${ }^{14}$ I desire then that younger widows marry, bear children, guide the house, give none occasion to the adversary for reviling. ${ }^{15}$ For some have already turned themselves aside after Satan. ${ }^{16}$ If any [man or] woman that believeth have widows, let them relieve them, and let not the church be burdened, that it may relieve them that are widows indeed.
${ }^{17}$ Let the elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honor, especially they who labor in the word and doctrine. ${ }^{1 s}$ For the scripture saith, Thou shalt not muzzle an or while he is treading out the corn ; and, the laborer is worthy of his hire. ${ }^{19}$ Against an elder receive not an accusation, except on the authority of two or three witnesses. ${ }^{20}$ Them that sin rebuke before all, that the rest also may have fear. ${ }^{21}$ I solemnly charge thee before God, and
from,' etc. : 'wandering,' Auth., simil. Bish. ; 'runne about,' Coverd. All Vv. except Auth. connect $\mu$ avi $\alpha$ д́vovotv with $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \epsilon \rho \chi$ б $\mu \in \nu \alpha$.
14. Desire then] 'Will therefore,' Auth. and all V . . Younger widows] So Wicl.: 'the younger women,' Auth., and all the other Vv. except Rhem., 'the yonger.' For reviling] 'To speak reproachfully,' Auth. [in Marg., 'for their railing'] ; 'to speake evill,' Tynd., Cov. (both), Cran., Gen., Rhem.; 'slanderously,' Bish. Very singularly Wicl., 'because of cursed thing,' misunderstanding the Vulg. 'maledicti gratiâ.'
15. Have already, ete.] 'Are already turned,' Auth., and similarly all other Vv. It seems, however, desirable to retain the medial force which appears to be invoived in the passive form ? $\begin{aligned} & \text { Eecp. } \\ & \text {; }\end{aligned}$ see notes on ch. iv, 20, and 2 Tim. iv. 4. The aorist cannot here be translated without inserting 'have;' the Greek idiom permits the union of aor. with ク̈ö $\begin{aligned} & \text { к. T. } \lambda \text {., }\end{aligned}$ the English does not; see notes on ch. i. 20 (Transl.).
16. Burdened] So Rhem., 'be charg-
ed :' Auth, and all the other $V_{\mathrm{v}}$. except Wicl., 'be greved.'
18. An ox, etc.] 'The ox that,' Auth. and all Vvo except Wicl. and Coverd. (Test.), which retain the bare participle. Hire] So Wicl., Rhem. : 'reward,' Auth. and the other $\mathrm{Vv}_{\mathrm{v}}$ except $\operatorname{Cov}$. (Test.), 'wages.'
19. Except] 'But,' Auth. and all Vv.;
 requires a little more distinctness.
On the authority of $]$ All the $V_{v}$. appy. with a similar meaning, 'under;' Auth., alone, 'before,' but in margin 'under.'
20. The rest, etc.] So Rhem., and similarly Cov. (Test.) : 'others also may fear,' Auth., and sim. all remaining $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$.
21. Solemnly charge] 'Charge,' Autho; 'testifie,' Tynd. and all other Vv. except Wicl., 'preie before.' Tho translation 'adjure,' Conyb. and Hows., is better reserved for $\delta p \kappa i(\omega \omega$, Mark v. 7, Acts xix. 13, 1 Thess. v. $27 . \quad$ Christ Jesus] *' The Lord Jesus Christ,' Auth. Forrjudgment] So Cov. (Test.), and sim. Wicl., Rhem., 'prejudice:' 'without preferring one before another,' Auth., sim. Gen.; 'hasty judgment,' Tynd.,

Christ Jesus, and the elect angels, that thou observe these things without forejudgment, doing nothing by partiality. ${ }^{22}$ Lay hands hastily on no man, nor yet share in other men's sins. Keep thyself pure. ${ }^{23}$ Be no longer a waterdrinker, but use a little wine for thy stomach's sake and thine often infirmities. ${ }^{24}$ Some men's sins are openly manifest, going before to judgment ; and some men they rather follow after. ${ }^{25}$ In like manner the Good works also of some are openly manifest; and they that are otherwise camiut be hid.

## CHAPTER VI.

Let as many as are under the yoke as bond-serrants count their own masters worthy of all honor, that the name of God and His doctrine be not blasphemed. 2 They again that have believing masters, let them not slight them, because they are brethren; but the rather serve them, because believing and beloved are they who are partakers of their good service. These things teach and exhort.

Cov., and sim. Cran., 'hastiness of j .' There seems no reason for rejecting the genuine English translation adopted by Cov. (Test.); 'forejudgment' is also used by Spenser.
22. Hastily] So Cov. (Test.) : 'suddenly,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Wiclif, 'anoon;' Rhem., 'lightly.'
Nor yet, etc.] 'Neither be partaker of,' Auth. and the other $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$. except Wicl., 'comyno thou with;' Coverd. (Test.), © be partener of;' Rhem., 'communieate with.'
23. Be no longer, etc.] 'Drink no longer water,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Wicl., 'drynke water,' Cou. (Test.), ' drink no more w. ;'. Rhem., 'drink not yet w.,' not a very felicitous translation.
24. Openly manifest] 'Open beforehand,' Auth. and other Vr. except: Wicl., 'opene befor;' Corerd. (Test.), Rhem., 'manifest;' Cov. ' open.'
Rather follow] 'Follow,' Auth.: Coverd. (Test.), is the only one of the older translators who has preserved(though not quite
correctly) the kal; 'and the (synnes) of some do followe also.'
25. In like manner] 'Likewise also,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Wicl., 'and also;' Rhem., 'in like manner also.' Works also] ' Works,' Auth. Openly manifest] ' Manifest beforeliand,' Autho.

Chapter VI. 1. As many as are] 'As many servants as are,' Auth. and all tho Vr. (sim. Wicl., Cov. (Test.), 'whatever servants are ') except Rhien., 'whosoever are servantes under yoke.'
2. They again] 'And they,' Auth., Wicl., Bish.: 'but they,' Cov. (Test.), Rhem.; the remaining $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v} .}$ omit the particle. In a case like the present, the omission in translation is certainly to be preferred to 'and,' as the contrast hetween the two classes, those who have hoathen, and those who have Christian masters is thus less obscured. In such cases the translation of $\delta$ t is very trying; 'but' is too strong, 'and' is inexact ;
${ }^{3}$ If any man is a teacher of other doctrine, and assenteth not to sound words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to the doctrine which is according to godliness ; ${ }^{4} \mathrm{He}$ is besotted with pride, yet knowing nothing, but ailing abont questions and strifes of words, whercof cometh enry, contentions, railings, evil surmisings, ${ }^{5}$ obstinate contests of men corrupted in their mind and destitute of the truth, supposing that golliness is a means of gain. ${ }^{6}$ But godliness with contentment is a means of great gain. ${ }^{7}$ For we hrought
omission, or some turn like that in the text, seems the only way of conveying the exact force of the original.
Slight] 'Despise,' Auth, and all Vv. except Rhem., 'contemn.'
The rather] So Gen., Rhem., and simil. Wicl., 'more serve,' Tynd., 'so moche the rather:' Auth. and remaining V V., 'rather.' Scrve them] So
Wicl., Cov. (Test.), and Rhem. (omit 'them ') : 'do them service,' Auth.; 'do service,' Tynd. and remaining Vv.
Believing, etc.] Similarly Wicl., Rhem. : 'they are faithful and beloved, partakers of the benefit,' Auth.; 'they are believing and beloved and partakers of the ben.,' Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen. ('faithful') Bish.; 'they are faithful and bel., for they are, etc.,' Cov . (Test.).
3. Is u teacher, ette.] 'Teach othervise,' Auth., Wicl., Tynd., Cov. (both), Bish.; 'folowe other doctrine,' Cran.; 'teache other doctrine,' Gen.; see notes on cl. i.
3. The ell $\tau$ Is, as the context here shows (comp. ch. i. 3), contemplates a case actually in existence ; wo use then in Engl. the indicative after 'if;' see Latham, Engl. Lang. § 537 (ed.4).
Assentelh] ' Consent,' Autho, Bish,, Rhiem.; 'accordith,' Wicl.; 'agreeth,' Coverd. (both) ; ' is not content,' Tynd., Gen.; 'enclyne,' Cran.

Sound] So
Auth. everyvhere else in these Epp.: Auth. and all Vv. except Rhem. ('sound') here adopt 'wholesome.'
4. Besolted with pride] 'He is proud,' Auth., Wicl., Cov. (Test.), Rhem.; ' puft ap,' Tynd. and the remaining $\mathrm{Vr}_{\text {. }}$; see
notes on ch. iii. $6 . \quad Y$ Yet knouring] 'Knowing,' Auth., Cov. (Test.), Bish., likem. ; ' and knoweth,' 'Iynd. and the remaining Vv. except Wiol., 'and can nothing,'-a noticeable expression. Ailing] 'Doting,' Suth, Bish.; 'langwischith,' Wich, Rhem.; ' is not sounde,' Cov. (Test.); 'wasteth his braynes,' Tynd. and the remaining $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$. Contentions] * 'Strife,' Auth.
5. Obstinate contests] * 'Perverso disputings,' Auth.

Corrupted in their mind] So Rhem., and similarly Wicl.: ' of corrupt minds,' Auth., Bish.; 'with corrupt minds,' Tynd., Genev:: 'as have, etc.' Cov., Cran.; ' are corruptminded,' Covi. (Test.).
Godliness, etc.] ' Gain is godliness,' Auth., and similarly all the other V.v. ('lucre is godliness,' Tynd., Cran., Gener., etc.) except only Cov. (both), who preserves the correct order 'godliness is lucre.' This is not the only instance in which this very able translator stands alone in accuracy and good scholarship. Though ho used Tyndale's translation as his basis, his care in revision still entitles lim to bo considered as a separate authority of great importance ; see Bagster's Hexapla, p. 73. His Duoglott Testament (Test.), bcing from the Lat., has not the same claim on attention. Gain]
After this word, Auth. inserts * 'f from such withdraw thyself.
7. The] So Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen., Bish.: 'this,' Auth., Wicl., Cov. (Test.), Rhem. Can also] 'Can,' Auth. and the other $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{V}}$. The transla.
nothing into the morld, and it is certain we can also carry nothing out. 8 If however we have food and raiment, therewith we shall be content. ${ }^{9}$ But they that desire to be rich fall into temptation and a snare, and into many foolish and hurtful lusts, the which drown men in destruction and perdition. ${ }^{10}$ For the love of money is the root of ail evils; which while some were coveting after, they erred from the faith, and pierced themselves through with many sorrows.
${ }^{11}$ But thou, 0 man of God, flee these things ; and follow after righteousness, godliness, faith, love, patience, meekness of heart. ${ }^{12}$ Strive the good strife of faith, lay hold on eternal life, whereunto
tion of Tynd., Cov., is here somewhat curious, - ' and it is a playne case.'
8. If, however, we have] Somewhat sim. Cran., 'but when we have ; ' so also Tynd., Cov., Gen., omitting ' but:' ' and having,' Auth. 'but having,' Wicl., Cov. (Test.), Rhem. Auth. thus stands alone in itstranslation of $\delta \bar{\epsilon}$, ' and.'
Therewith, etc.] 'Let us be therewith content,' Auth., Tynd., Coverd. (both), Genev.; 'we schulen be,' Wicl. ; 'we must be,' Cran. ; 'we are,' Rhem.
9. Desire] 'Will,' Auth, and all other VV. ; see notes on ch. v. 14.
Into many] So Auth. and all the other Vv. : Cov. ('Test.) and Rhem. omit 'iuto.' This insertion of the preposition, where not expressed in the text, is sometimes very undesirable (comp. John iii. 5, and see Blunt, Lect. on Par. Priest, p. 56) ; here, however, it would seem permissible; $\pi \in t \rho a \sigma \mu \partial \nu$ and $\pi a \gamma i \delta a$ thus stand in closer union (sce notes), and the relative becomes better associated with its principal antecedent.

The which] Similarly Cov. (Test.), 'ye whych do,' marking the force of the aitives, though in the Lat. it is only 'quæ:' 'which,' Auth. and all Vv.
10. Were coveting] 'Coveted,' Auth., and very similarly Tynd., Cov., Cran., Bish. ; 'coveting,' Wicl.; 'lusting,' Cov. (Test.). The sentence is somewhat awkward, but seems preferable to the diluted translation, ' and some through covet-
ing it, have, etc.,' as Conyb. and others. Erred] So all Vv. except Auth., Coverd. (Test.), and Rhem., which insert 'have.' Perhaps the translation 'wandered or strayed aivay' (comp. notes on Tit. iii. 3) may be thought a little preferable.
11. And follow] So Author., Bish., Rhem.; the extreme awkwardness of 'but,' so closely following 'but thou,' may justify this inexactness. Wicl. and Cov. (Test.) boldly retain 'but' in both cases; Tynd. and the remaining $\mathrm{VV}_{\mathrm{v}}$. omit the second. Patience] So Auth. and all Vv. This is the regular translation of $\begin{aligned} & \pi o \mu o v \eta \\ & \text { in } \\ & \text { the } \\ & \text { N. T., }\end{aligned}$ where it occurs above thirty times. The only exceptions to this translation are in Rom. ii. 7, 2 Cor. i. 6, 2 Thess. iii. 5. On the true meaning see notes on 2 Tim. ii. 10, and on Tit. iii. 2.

Meekness of heart] *'Mcekness,' Auth.
12. Strive the good strife] Similarly Wicl., a good strife:' Auth. and all other Vv. (except Cov . (both), 'a good, etc.') have 'fight the good fight.' The transl. in the text is undoubtedly not satisfactory, but is perhaps a little more exact than that of Auth.

Wert callcd] 'Art * also called,' Auth.
Thou confessedst] 'Hast confessell,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Wicl., Coverd. (Test.), 'hast knowleched ; ' I'hem. ' hast conf.' The] ' A,' Auth. and all Vv. Confession] So Rhem. : ' profession;'Auth. and the remaining $V v$. except Wich.,
thou wert called, and thou confessedst the good confession before many witnesses. ${ }^{13}$ I charge thee before God, who preserveth alive all things, and before Christ Jesus, who under Pontius Pilate bore witness to the good confession, ${ }^{14}$ That thou keep the commandment without spot, without reproach, until the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ: ${ }^{25}$ which in His own seasons IIe shall show, who is the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings and Lord of lords ; ${ }^{16}$ Who alone hath immortality, dwelling in light unapproachable; whom never man saw, nor can see: to whom be honor and eternal might, Amen.
${ }^{17}$ Charge them that are rich in this world not to be highminded,

Cov. (Test.), 'knowledge.'
13. Charge thiee] 'Give thee charge,'

Auth. and the other Vv. except Wicl., Cov. (Test.), Rhem., 'command.'
Before] So Wicl., Cov. (both), Rhem.: 'in the sight of,' Auth. and remaining Vv. It certainly here seems desirable to preserve a uniform translation of $\begin{gathered}\mathrm{e} \\ \boldsymbol{\omega}- \\ \text { - }\end{gathered}$ trov; compare notes.
Preserveth alive] * 'Quickeneth,' Auth.
Under] So all the Vv. except Auth. and Cov. (Test.), which adopt the local 'before.'

Bore witness to]
' Witnessed,' Auth., Bish. ('profession '); 'yielded a witnessing,' Wicl.; 'gave testimony,' Rhem.; Tynd. and the remaining $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{V} ., \text {, 'witnessed a good wit- }}$ ness,' or 'witnessing.'.

The]
' A,' Auth. and all Vv.
14. The] So all the Vv. except Auth., Gen., 'this.' Without reproach] Similarly Wicl., 'with out repref:' 'unrebukeable' Author., Tynd., Cranm., Genev., Bish.; ' 'unreproveable,' Cov.; 'unblameable,' Coverd. (Test.); 'blameless,' Rhem. The connection of the adjectives with èvoonخ̀v is perhaps made a little clearer by the change: so Syr., 'without spot, without blemish;' comp. notes.
15. His own] 'His,' Auth.: and the other Vv. except Tynd., Gen., 'when the tyme is come;' Rhem., 'due.'
Seasons] So Cov. (Test.) : 'times,' Auth.
and the remaining $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{r}}$. except Tynd., Gen. (see above) ; Cov., 'tyme.'
Who is] So Auth., following all the older Vv. except Coverd. ('Test.), which, however, retains the order, 'whom shall sherve at hys seasons the blessed,' and Wicl., Rhem., which put the nominative first. It would seem that the insertion of 'who is,' is here a far less evil than the loss of order. Conybeare changes the active into pass., ' be made manifest (?) by the only, etc.,' - a diluted translation that wholly falls short of the majesty of the original.
16. Alone] 'Only,' Auth.

Immortality] Wicl. alone has the noticeable translation 'undeedlynes.'
Liglt] So Wicl., Tynd., Rhem.: 'the light,' Auth. and the remaining Vv. except Cov., 'a light.'
Unapproachable] Similarly Cov. (Test.), ' 10 t approachable ;' Rhem., ' not accessible:' 'which no man may approach unto,' Autlo. ' 'to whiche no man mai come,' Wicl.; 'that no man can attayne,' Tynd., Cov., Cran., and Genev., Bish. ('att. unto').
Never man saw] So Tynd., Gen.: 'no man hath scen,' Auth., Cov., Cran., Bish.; ' no man saie,' Wicl.; 'no man dyd euer se,' Cov. (Test.)

Eternal might] 'Power everlasting,' Auth. and all Vv. except Wicl. ' withouten end.'
17. Not to be] 'That they be not,'
nor to place their hopes on the uncertainty of riches, but in God, who giveth us all things richly for enjoyment ; ${ }^{18}$ that they do good, that they be rich in good works, be fiee in distributing, ready to communicate ; ${ }^{19}$ laying up in store for themselves a good foundation against the time to come, that they may lay hold on the true life. ${ }^{20}$ O Timothy, keep the trust committed to thee, avoiding the profane babblings and oppositions of the falsely-called knowledge; ${ }^{21}$ which some professing have gone wide in aim concerning the faith. Grace be with you.

Auth. Slight change, designed to obviate the supposition that the original is Zva $\mu \eta$ к. т. $\lambda$. The transition to the positive side of the exhortation in ver. 18 thus also becomes slightly more telling and distinct.

To place their hopes on] 'Trust in,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Wicl., 'hope in.'
The uncertainty of $]$ So Coverd. (Test.), Rhem., and similarly Wicl. and Author. (Marg.), 'in uncerteynte of:' 'uncertain,' Auth., Cran., Bish.; 'the uncertayne,' Tynd., Cov., Gen.
God] 'The * living God,' Auth.
All things richly] *'Richly all things,' Auth. For enjoyment] 'To enjoy,' Auth., Cov. (Test.), Gen., Bish., Rhem. ; 'to use,' Wicl. ; 'to enjoy them,' Tynd., Cov., Cran.
18. Be free in, etc.] 'Ready to distribute,' Auth.; 'lightly to geue,' Wicl.; 'redy to geve,' Tynd., Cran., Genev., Bish.; 'that they geve and distribute,' Cov.; 'to geue with a good wyll,' Cov. (Test.) ; 'to give easily,' Rhem.
19. The true, ] * 'Eternal,' Auth.
20. The trust, etc.] 'That which is committed to thy trust,' Auth.; 'the thing betakun to thee,' Wicl.; 'that which is geven the to kepe,' Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen., Bish.; 'that which is committed unto the,' Cov. (Test.) ; 'depositum,' Rhem. The] Auth. and the other Vv . except Rhem. omit art. The translation of $\beta \in \beta$ भ$\lambda$ ous, ' ungostly,' Tynd., Cov. (both), Cran., Gen., deserves recording. Profane] 'Profane and vain babblings,' Auth.
The falsely-called, etc.] Similarly Rhem. (omit art.): 'science falsely so called,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Wicl., 'of fals name of kunnynge;' Corerd. (Test.), ' of a false name of knowledge.'
21. Have gone wide, etc.] 'Have erred,' Auth. and all Vv. except Wicl., 'fellen doun;' Cov. (Test.), 'are fallen awaye;' Cran., 'erred.' English idiom scems here to require the insertion of 'have' after the present participle.
After 'thee' Auth. inserts * 'Amen.'

## TIIE SECOND EPISTLE TO TIMOTHY.

## CHAPTERI.

PAUL, an apostle of Christ Jesus by the will of God, for the promise of life which is in Christ Jesus, ${ }^{2}$ to Timothy, my beloved child. Grace, mercy, peace, from God the Father and Christ Jesus our Lord.
${ }^{3}$ I thank God, whom I serve from my forefathers with a pure conscience, - as unceasing is the remembrance which I have of thee in my prayers night and day, ${ }^{4}$ longing to see thee, being mindful of thy tears, that I may be filled with joy ; ${ }^{5}$ being put in remembrance of the unfeigned faith that is in thee, which dwelt first in thy grandmother Lois, and thy mother Eunice, and I am persuaded that it dwelleth also in thee. ${ }^{6}$ For which cause I remind

1. Christ Jesus] 'Jesus Christ,' Auth. For the] Similarly but more periphrastically, Tynd., Cov., 'to preache the,' etc. : ' according to the,' Auth., Cov. (Test.), Cran., Gen., Bish., Rhem.; ' bi the beheest of life,' Wicl.
2. Beloved child] 'Dearly beloved son,' Author.; 'his most dereworthi sone,' Wicl.; 'his beloved s.,' Tynd., Cran.; 'my dear son,' Cov.; ' my moost deare son ; Coverd. (Test.) ; 'my beloved son,' Genev.; ' $a$ beloved son,' Bisht.; ' my deerest s.,' Rhem. On the translation of тér $\kappa \nu \varphi$, , compare notes on 1 Tim. i. 2 (Transl.). Peace) 'And peace,' Auth.
3. A pure] So Cov. (hoth), Rhem.: 'pure,' Auth. and the remaining Vr. except Wicl., 'clene consciens.'
As unceasing, etc.] 'That without ceas-
ing I have remembrance,' Auth., Gen., Bish.; ' that with outen ceesynge I haue mynde,' Wicl.; 'that without c. I make mencion,' Tynd., Cov. (both), Cranm.; 'without intermission I have a memorie,' Rhem.
4. Longing] 'And longe,' Cov.; so, also, without any intensive force in $\dot{e} \pi \hat{\ell}$, the other $\mathrm{Vr}_{\mathrm{r}}$. ('desiring'), except Auth., 'greatly desiring.'
5. Being put, etc.] * When I call to remembrance,' Auth.
That it, etc.] So Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen., Bish., except that they put 'also' last: 'that in thee also,' Auth., Cov. (Test.), Rhem. ; 'that also in thee,' Wicl. Perspicuity seems to require in English tho repetition of the verb.
6. For which cause] So Wicl., and Cov. (Test.), Rhem. ('the which'): 'where-
thee to stir up the gift of God, which is in thee through the laying on of my hands. ${ }^{7}$ For God gave us not the spirit of cowardice, but of power, and of love, and of self-control.
${ }^{8}$ Be not thou ashamed then of the testimony of our Lord, nor yet of me His prisoner; but rather suffer afflictions with me for the Gospel in accordance with the porver of God. © Who saved us, and called us with an holy calling, not according to our works, but according to His own purpose and the grace which was given us in Christ Jesus before eternal times; ${ }^{10}$ but hath been now made manifest through the appearing of our Saviour Jesus Christ, when He
fore,' Author, and the remaining $\mathrm{Vv}_{\mathrm{V}}$ o 0 ט̀v is omitted in Tynd. Comp. ver. 12, where Auth. preserves the more literal translation.
I remind thee to] 'I put thee in remembrance that thou,' Auth., Bish.; 'I warne the that thou,' Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen. ; ' I moneste thee that thou,' Wicl., Rhem. ('admonish') ; 'I exhorte thee that thou,' Cov. (Test.). Though all the Vv. adopt this periphrasis, it still seems desirable to preserve the simple inf., if only to distinguish it from iva with subj., which the transl. of Conyb., 'I call thee to remembrance, that thou mayest,' etc., seems still more decidedly to imply.
Through the] 'By the,' Auth. and all the other Vv.

Laying on] So Cov. (Test.): 'putting on,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Wicl., 'settynge on ; ' Rhem., 'imposition.'
7. Gave us not] So Wicl.: 'hath not given us,' Auth. and all the other V .
Cowurdice] 'Fear,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Wicl;, 'drede.' It may be remarked that the Genevan is the only version which uses a capital to 'Spirito' Self-control] 'A sound mind,' Author., Gen., Bish.; 'sobirnesse,' Wicl., Cov. (Test.), Cian., and sim. Tynd., 'sobreness of mind;' Rhem., 'sobriety;' 'right understondynge,' Cov .
8. Ashamed then] 'Therefore ashamed,'. Auth., Cov. (Test.), Cran., Genev., Bish., Rhem. ; 'ashamed therefore,' Cov.:
oūv is omitted in Tynd. Nor yet] 'Nor,' Auth., Cov. (Test.), Rhem.; ' neither,' Wicl. and the remaining Vv. But rather, etc.] 'Be thou partaker of the afflictions of,' Auth., Gen.; 'suffre adversite with the,' Tynd., Cov., Cran.; 'traveile thou to gidre in the,' Wicl.; 'labour with the,' Cov. (Test.) ; 'travail with the,' Rhem. In accordance with] ' According to,' Auth., Cran., Cov. (both), Bish., Rhem.; 'bi the vertu of,' Wicl. ; ' through,' T'ynd., Gen.
9. Saved] So Tynd., Cran., Gen., and sim. Wicl., 'delyuerid;' 'hath saved,' Auth., Cov., Bish.; 'hath delyured,' Cov. (Test.), Rhem.

The grace] 'Grace,' Auth. and all the other Vv.: Wicl. alone puts a comma after 'purpose.' Sce Scholef. Hints (in loc.).
Eternal times] 'Before the world began,' Auth., Cran., Bish., and similarly Tynd., Genev. ('world was ') ; 'worldli times,' Wicl.; 'the tyme of the worlde,' Cov.; 'the everlastynge times,' Cov. (Test.); 'the secular times,' Rhem.
10. Hath been now] 'Is now,' Auth.

Through] 'By,' Auth. and all the other Vv. Though 'by' has appy. often in English the force of 'by means of,' yet here, on account of the sià below, it scems best to be uniform in translation. Made death, etc.] 'Hath abolished death,' Auth.; ' distried death,' Wicl., and sim. Coverd. (Test.), Rhem. ('hath'); 'hath
made death of none effect, and brought life and incorruption to light throngh the Gospel: ${ }^{11}$ whereunto I was appointed a herald, and an apostle, and a teacher of the Gentiles. ${ }^{12}$ For which cause I suffer also these things : nevertheless I am not ashamed ; for I know in whom I have put my trust, and am pelsuaded that He is able to keep the trust committed unto me against that day. ${ }^{\text {15 }}$ Hold the pattern of sound words, which thou heardest from me, in faith and love which is in Christ Jesus. ${ }^{14}$ The good trust committed unto thee keep through the IIoly Ghost which diwelleth in us.
${ }^{15}$ Thou knowest this, that all they which are in Asia turned array from me; of whom are Phygelus and Hermogenes. ${ }^{16}$ The Lord give mercy unto the house of Onesiphorus; for he oft refreshed me, and was not ashamed of my chain: ${ }^{17}$ but on the contrary, when he arrived in Rome, he sought me out the more diligently, and
put away,' Tynd., Cran., Gen.; 'hath taken awaye,' Cov. Incorruption] So Wicl., Coverd. (Test.), Rhem.: ' immortality,' Auth. and the remaining Vv.
11. I was] 'I am,' Auth. and all the other $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{r}}$. Herald] ' Preacher,' Auth. and all the other $\mathrm{V} v$.
12. Which] As in ver. 6 ; so Wicl.: 'the which,' Auth. and remaining Vv. Suffer also] 'Also suffer,' Auth, and the other Vv. except Wich., Coverd. (Test.), Rhem., 'also I suffer.'
In whom, etc.] So Cran., 'whom I have believed:' Auth., Tynd., Cov. (both), Gen., Bish., Rhem., and similarly Wicl., 'to whom I shall haue bil.'
The trust, ete.] Similarly Wicl., 'that is taken to my kepynge ; ' Rhem., 'my depositum:' ' that which I have committed unto Him,'Auth. and remaining $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$.
13. Hold] 'Hold fast,' Auth.; ' have thou,' Wicl., Cov. (Test.), Rhem.; 'se thou have,' Tynd., Cran., Gen., Bish.; ' hold the [thee] after,' Cov. The transl. of Auth., thus at variance with the old versions, is still retained by Conybeare, but is clearly incxact.
The pattern] So Bish. : 'the form,' Auth., Wicl.; 'the ensample,' Tynd., Coverd. (both), Cran., Gen.; 'a form,' Rhem.

Heardest] So .Wict., Tynd., Cov., Gen. : 'Hast heard,' Auth. and the remaining Vr. From me] 'Of me,' Auth. and all $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$.
14. The good trust] 'That good thing which was,' Auth., Tynd., Cran., Bish.; 'the good takun to thi kepynge,' Wicl.; 'this hye charge,' Cov.; 'the good thing comm. unto the,' Cov. (Test.) ; 'that worthy thing which was, etc.,' Genev.; ' the good depositum,' Rhem.
Through] So Cov. (both), Cran., Gen., Bish.: ' by,' Auth., Wicl., Rhem.; 'in,' Tynd.
15. Thou lnowest this] So Pliem., and sim. Wicl.: ! this thou knowest,' Auth. and remaining $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$. Turned]
' Be turned,' Auth. and all Vv. except Cov. (Test.), 'are turned;' Rhem., 'be averted.' Plygelus] *'Phygellus,' Auth.
17. Arrived in] 'Was in,' Author., Bish.; 'came to,' Wiclif; 'was at,' Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen.; 'was come. to,' Cov. (Test.), Rhem.
The more dil.] 'Very diligently,' Auth., and the other V v. except Wicl., ' bisili ;' Coverd. (Test.), 'diligently;' Rhem., 'carefully.'
18. Ministered] 'Ministered unto me,'
found me. ${ }^{18}$ The Lord grant unto him that he might find mercy of the Lord in that day : and in how many things he ministered at Ephesus, thou knowest better than I.

## CHAPTER II.

Thou, therefore, my child, be inwardly strengthened in the grace that is in Christ Jesus. ${ }^{2}$ And the things that thou heardest from me among many witnesses, these commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also. ${ }^{3}$ Suffer with me afflictions as a good soldier of Christ Jesus. ${ }^{4}$ No man serving as a soldier entangleth himself with the affairs of life; that he may please him who chose him to be a soldier. ${ }^{5}$ Again, if a man also strive in the

Auth. and all the other $\mathrm{Vv}_{\mathrm{v}}$ except Cov . (Test.), 'hath served.'
Better than 1] 'Very well,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Wicl., Rhem., 'better,' Cov. (Test.), 'best.'

Chapter II. 1. Therefore] So Auth. and all V v . Here, perhaps, this translation may be retained: 'then' may be thought slightly too weak, as the meaning seems to be, 'as others have fallen away do thou make up for their defection:' compare notes on 1 Tim. ii. 1 (Transl.).
Child] 'Son,' Auth. and other Vv.
Inwardly strengthened] ' Be strong,' Auth. and the other $\mathrm{V} v$. except Wicl., ' be comforted,' where the passive force is rightly preserved.
2. Heardest from] 'Hast heard of,' Auth. Among] So Auth.: ' bimany,' ctc., Wicl., Cor., Cov. (Test.), Cran., Bish., Rhem.; ' many bearynge witness,' Tyind., Gen. Perhaps 'in the presence of,' or ' with many to bear witness,' may convey the idiomatic use of otà a little more exactly; as both translations are, however, somewhat periphrastic, the $\mathbf{d} u$ th. is retained.
These] So Rhem., and in a different
order, Wicl.: 'the same,' Auth. and remaining $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$.
3. Suffer, etc.] Auth. prefixes * thou therefore.' Suffer afflictions] So Tynd., Coverd., Cranm., Gen., Bish., omitting, however, ' with me:' 'endure hardness,' Auth. (but comp. ch. iv. 5); 'traueil,' Wicl.; 'labour,' Cov. (Test.), Rhem. Christ Jesus] * ‘Jesus Christ,' Auth.
4. Serving as, etc.] 'That warreth,' Auth., Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen., Bish.; 'holdinge knyghthood,' Wicl.; 'warrynge,' Cov. (Test.) ; ' being a souldiar,' Rhem. Llife] 'This life,' Author., Bish.; 'worldli nedis,' Wicl.; 'worldly busynes,' Tynd., Coverd. (both plural), Cranm., Genev.; 'secular businesses,' Phem. Chose] 'Hath chosen,' Auth. and the other VV. except Wicl., 'to whom he hath preued hym self;' Cov. (Test.), 'hath allowed hym;' Whem., 'hath approved him self.'
5. Again] 'And,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Wicl., Cov. (Test.), Rhem., 'for.' Strive in, etc.] 'Strive for masteries,' Auth., and similarly Cov. (both), Tynd., Cranm., Genev., Rhem.; 'figtith in bateile,' Wicl.; 'wrestle,' Bish. He is] 'Yet is he,'
games, he is not crowned, except he strive according to rule. ${ }^{6}$ The laborivg husbandman ought to partake first of the fruits. ${ }^{7}$ Understand what I say, for the Lord will give thee apprehension in all things.
${ }^{8}$ Bear in remembrance Jesus Christ as raised from the dead, born of the seed of David, according to MY gospel: 9 in the which I suffer afflictions as an evil doer even unto bonds; howbeit the word of God hath not been bound. ${ }^{10}$ For this cause I endure all things for the sake of the elect, that they also may obtain the salvation which is in Christ Jesus with eternal glory. " Faithful is the saying: For if we be dead with Him, we shall also live with Him: ${ }^{12}$ if we endure, we shall also reign with Him: if we shall

Auth. and the other $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$ except Wicl,, 'schal not be;' Cov. (Test.), ' is not.' According to rulec] 'Lawfutly,' Auth. and all the other Vv. except Gen., 'as he oght to do.'
6. The luboring, etc.] So Cov. (Test.), Bish.: 'the husb. that laboureth,' Auth., Tynd., Cov., Cran., Rhem.; 'an erthetilier,' Wicl. ; 'must first by laboryng receaue,' Gen. Ought to, etc.]
'Must be first partaker,' Auth., and sim. Bish. ('first be') ; 'it behoueth etc. to resceyue first,' Wicl.; 'must fyrst receave,' Tynd., Cov. (Test.), Cran., sim. Gien. (seo above); 'must first enjoye,' Cov.
7. Understand] So Wicl., Rhemish; 'consider,' Auth. and the remaining Vv. except Cov. (Test.), ' marke.'
For the Lord, etc.] 'And the Lord *give,' Auth. Apprehension] 'Understanding,' Auth. and all the Vv.: change made only to avoid the repetition 'xnderst. - understanding,' as in Wicl., Rhiem, al.
8. Bear in remembrance] 'Remember that,' Auth., Tynd., Cov., Cran., Bish., Gen.; similarly Wicl., Rhem., ' be thon (om. Rhem.) myndeful that;' 'remember the Lord to be, etce., Cov. (Test.). As raised, etc.] ' Of the seed of David was raised from the dead, etc.,' Auth.,
and similarly, with a few slight variations, all the other $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{V}}$. except Rhem., which inverts the order, 'is risen againe from the dead, of the seede of David.'
9. In the which] So Cov. (Test.) and Wicl. (omits 'the'): 'wherein,' Auth. and the remaining V .
Afflictions] 'Trouble,' Author. and the other $\mathrm{Vv}_{\mathrm{v}}$. except Wicl., 'traueil ;' Cov., 'suffre;' Cov. (Test.), Rhem., 'labour.' Howbeit] 'But,' Auth, and all the Vv. Hath not been] 'Is not,' Auth.
10. For this cause] So Author, in 1 Thess. ii. 13, iii. 5: 'therefore,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Tynd., 'herefore.' Sake of, etc.] 'The elect's sakes,' Auth. and the other V. except Wicl., 'for the chosen;' Coverd. (Test.), 'for the chosen's sake ;' Rhem., 'for the elect.' They nlso may] So Cov. (both), Rhem.: 'they may also,' Auth., and similarly the rem. Vv.
11. Faithful is the] 'It is a faithful saying,' Auth., Bish.; 'a trewe word,' Wicl. ; 'it is a true saying,' Tynd., Cran., Gen.; 'this is a true s.,' Cov. (both).; 'a faithful saying,' Rhem.
12. Endure] 'Suffer,' Author., Wicl., Gen.; 'be pacient,' Tynd., Cov., Cran., Bish.; 'have pacience,' Cov. (Test.); 'sustaine,' Rhem. A change of meaning in two verses so contiguous as this
deny Itim, He also will deny us: ${ }^{18}$ if we be faithless, yet He continueth faithful; for he cannot deny Himself.
${ }^{14}$ Of these things put them in remembrance, solemnly charging them before the Lord not to contend about words, a profitless course, to the subverting of the hearers. ${ }^{15}$ Study to present thyself approved unto God, a workmau not ashamed, rightly laying out the word of truth. ${ }^{16}$ But avoid profane babblings ; for they will advance to greater measures of ungodliness, ${ }^{17}$ and their word will spread as doth a gangrene. Of whom is Hymenæus and Philetus, ${ }^{18}$ men who concerning the truth have missed their aim,
and verse 10 , does not seem desirable. Shall deny] * 'Deny,' Auth.
13. Be faithless] Similarly Bish., 'be unfaithful,' to preserve the paronomasia of the original : 'believe not,' Auth. and all the remaining V .
Continueth] So Rhem.: 'abideth,' Auth., Tynd., Coverd., Cran.; 'dwelleth,' Wicl. The transl. in the text is perhaps that best suited to the context ; 'abideth,' seems too strong, 'remaineth' too weak; the latter, as Crabb (Synon. p. 291) remarks, is often referred to involuntary, if not compulsory, actions.
For He cannot] * 'Ho cannot,' Auth.
14. Solemnly charging] ' Charge,' Auth.; 'and testifie,' Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen., Bish. (omits 'and '); 'testifyenge,' Cov. ('Test.). Not to contend] 'That they strive not,' Auth.; an unnecessary periphrasis for the infin., appy. caused by following Tynd., Cranm., al., where, however, it was required after 'testify:' see above. On the true meaning of $\mu \dot{\alpha} \chi o \mu a l$, see notes on ver. 23.
A profitless course] 'To no profit,' Auth., Bish.; 'for to no thing it is profitable,' Wicl., sim: Cov. (Test.), Rhem. ; 'which is to no proffet,' Tynd., Cov., Gen., sim.
Cran.
To the, etc.] 'But to the, etc.,' Auth. and all Vv. except $C o v$. Test.), 'save to, etc.'
15. Present] So Rhem. : 'shew,' Auth. and all Vv . except Wicl., 'to geve the
self.' $\quad$ Not ashamed] 'That needeth not to be ashamed,' Auth., Tynd.' Cran., Gen., Bish.; 'without shame,' Wicl.; 'laudable,' Cov.; 'not beynge ash.,' Cov. (Test.) ; 'not to be confounded,' Rhem.

Laying out]
'Dividing,' Auth.; see notes.
16. Avoid] So Rhem. and Auth., Tit. iii. 9: here 'shun,' Auth.; 'eschewe,' Wicl., Cov. (both) ; 'passe over,' Tynd., Cran., Bish.; 'suppresse,' Gen.
Profune] Auth. adds 'and vain,' with Wicl., Tynd., Cov. (hoth), Gen., Rhem. ; 'vanytyes of voyces,' Cran.; 'voyces of vanite,' Bish. Advance, etc.] ' Will increase unto more,' Auth. ; 'profeten myche to,' Wicl. ; 'help moch to,' Cov.; 'avail much unto,' Cov. (Test.); 'encreace unto greater,' Tynd., Cranm., Gen., Bish. ; 'doe much grow to,' Rhem.
17. Spread] So Rhem.: 'eat,' Auth.; 'crepith,' Wicl.; 'fret,' Tynd., Coverd., Gran. Gangrene] So Auth. (Marg.) : 'canker,' Auth., Wicl., Tynd., Cran. (similarly), Gen., al.
18. Men who] 'Who,' Auth, and sin?. all other Vv. Missed their aim] 'Have crred,' Auth. and tho other Vv. except Wicl., 'felen doun fro;' Cov. (Test.), 'are fallen away.' The connection of the aor. with the present part., seems to require in English an insertion of the auxiliary verb; see notes on 1 Tim. i. 20 (Transl.).
saying that the resurrection is past already, and overthrow the faith of some. ${ }^{19}$ Nevertheless the firm foundation of God doth stand, having this seal, The Lord knoweth them that are IIis, and, Let every one that nameth the name of the Lord depart from unrightcousnoss. ${ }^{20}$ But in a great house there are not only ressels of gold and of silver, but also of wood and of earth; and some to honor, and some to dishonor. ${ }^{21}$ If a man then shall purge himself from these, he shall be a vessel unto honor, sanctified, meet for the master's use, prepared unto every good work.
${ }^{22}$ But flee the lusts of youth ; and follow after rightcousness, faith, love, peace with them that call on the Lord out of a pure heart. ${ }^{23}$ But foolish and unlearned questions eschew, knowing
19. Firm foundation] 'Foundation,' Auth., only; the rest insert an epithet, e..g. ' sad foundement,' Wicl.; 'sure grounde,' Tynd., Coo., Cranm., Genev.; 'sure foundamente,' Cov. (Test.), simil. Rhem.; 'strong found.,' Bish.
Doth stand] So Cov. (Test.), sim. Wicl., Rhem., 'standeth:' 'standeth sure,' Author. ; 'remayneth,' Tynd., Genev.; 'stondeth fast,' Cov.; 'standeth still,' Cran., Bish. * ' Of Christ,' Auth.

Unrighteousness] 'Iniquity,' Author. and the other Vv. except Wicl., Coverd., (Test.) ; the prevailing translation of à $\delta u k i a ~ t h r o u g h o u t ~ A u t h ., ~ i s ~ ' ~ u n r i g h t e o u s-~$ ness,' which there seems here no reason to:modify ; see notes.
21. Then] ' Therefore,' Auth. and all the other $V_{\mathrm{v}}$. except $T_{y n d}$., Cov., ' but.' Shall purge] Similarly Coverd. (Test.), Rhem., 'shall clense:' 'purgo,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Wicl., 'clensith.' The more exact translation 'shall have purged himself out of,' is perhaps somewhat too literal.

Meet for, etc.] * 'And meet,' Auth. In chap. iv. 11 , ë̈̌ $\chi \eta \sigma \tau o \nu$ is translated differently; the sense, however, is so substantially the same, that it seems scarcely desirable to alter, merely for the sake of uniformity, the present idiomatic translation.

Prepared] Auth. and the other Vv. except Wicl., Cov. (Test.), Rhem., which insert and.
22. But flee] So Rhem.: 'flee also,' Auth.; 'and fle,' Wicl. ; the rest omit the particle.

The lusts of youth] So Cov. (both) : ‘youthful lusts,' Auth.; 'desiris of youth,' Wicl.; 'lustes of youth,' Tynd., Cranm., Gen., Bish.; 'youthful desires,' Rhem.
And] ' But,' Auth.; comp. notes on 1 Fim. vi. 11 (Transl.)
Follow after] 'Follow,' Auth.
Love] 'Charity,' Auth.; see notes on 1 Tim. i. 5 (Transl.). Peace] Auth. adds a comma; Wicl. and Rhem. as Text.
23. Foolish, etc.] So Author, and the other $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$; the article, which appears to mark the 'current,' 'prevalent' questions of this nature, can scarcely be expressed ; the resolution of Conyb., 'the disputations of the foolish; etc.,' fails sufficiently to mark the intrinsic $\mu$ wpice and à $\pi a \dot{0}$ evala of the questions themselves.
Eschevw] So Wicl., Cov. (Test.) : 'avoid,' Auth., Rhem. ; 'put from thee,' Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen., Bish.
Contentions] 'Strifes,' Auth., and simil. the other Vr. except Wicl., 'chidingis;' Rhem., 'brawls;' see notes.
24. A servant] 'The servant,' Auth. and all the Vv .

Contend ${ }^{1}$
that they do gender contentions. ${ }^{24}$ And a servant of the Lord must not contend ; but be gentle unto all men, apt to teach, patient of wrong, ${ }^{25}$ in meekness disciplining those that oppose themselves; if God peradventure may give them repentance to come to the knowledge of the truth; ${ }^{26}$ and that they may return to soberness out of the snare of the devil, though holden captive by him, to do His will.

## CHAPTER III.

But know this, that in the last days grievous times shall ensue. ${ }^{2}$ For men shall be lovers of their orm selves, lovers of money,
'Strive,' Author., Tynd., etc.; 'chide,' Wicl. ; 'wrangle,' Rhem.
Patient of wrong] 'Patient,' Auth., Wicl., Cov. ('Test.), Rhem.; 'that can suffer the evyll,' Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen., and sim. Bish. (all connect with $\dot{\varepsilon} \nu \pi \rho a \check{\tau} \tau \eta \tau \iota$ ); 'that can forbear the euel,' Cov.
25. Disciplining] See notes on 1 Tim. i. 20, and Tit. ii. 12 : 'instructing,' Auth., Conyb., al., is not strong enough.
May give] 'Will give,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Wicl., Rhem., 'give.'
To come to, elc.] 'To the acknowledging of, etc.,' Auth.; ' that the knowen,' Wicl.; 'for to knowe,' Tynd., Cov., Cran.; ' to knowe,' Cov. (Test.), Rhem.; 'that they may know,' Gen.; 'to the knowledge of,' Bish. It will be observed that there is a slight fluctuation in our translation of $k \pi\{\gamma \nu \omega \sigma$ os. In some passages the context renders it desirable to express more fully the compound form (see notes on Eph. i. 17); in other cases (like the present) it seems to transpire with sufficient clearness, and may be left to be inferred by the reader. The truth really is that simply 'knowledge' is too weak, 'full knowledge' rather too strong, and between these there seems no intermediate term.
26. Returnto soberness] 'Recover themselves,' Auth., Rhem.; 'rise agen fro,'

Wicl.: 'come to themselves agayne,' Tynd., Cranm., Bish.; 'turne agayne from,' Cov. ; 'repent from,' Cov. (Test.); 'come to amendement,' Gen.
Though holden captive] Somewhat sim. Cran., Bish., 'which are holden captive' (Cov., ' 'holden in preson'): 'who are taken captive,' Auth.; ' of whom thei ben holden prisoners,' Wicl. ; 'which are now taken of him,' Tynd.; Genev. omits $\begin{gathered} \\ \text { Scurp. in } \\ \text { in translation; ' of whom }\end{gathered}$ they are held captive,' Rhem. Perhaps the slight modification in the translation of the part., and the attempt to express, the tense, may a little clear up this obseure passage. To do His will] 'At his will,' Author. and the other V'v. except Cov. (Test.), 'unto his will'; Gen. 'performe hys wyll.'

Chapter III. 1. But know this] Similarly 'but,' Wicl., Cov. (both) : 't this know also,' Auth., Bish.; ' this understonde,' Tynd., Gen. ; 'this know,' Cran.; 'and this know thou,' Rhem.
Grievous] 'Perilous,' Auth. and all the Vr. The translation 'times' (kalpor) is defensible; see notes on 1 Tim. iv. 1. Ensue] 'Come,' Auth., Tynd., Coverd., Cranm., Genev. ; 'schuln nygh,' Wicl.; 'be at hand,' Cov. (Test.), Bish.; 'approche,' Rhem.
bonsters, liaughty, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, ${ }^{3}$ without natural affection, implacable, slanderers, incoutinent, savage, haters of good, ${ }^{4}$ traitors, heady, besotted with pride, lovers of pleasires more than lovers of God; ${ }^{5}$ having an outward form of godliness, but denying the power thereof: from such turn away. © For of these are they which creep into houses, and lead captive silly women, laden with sins, led away with divers lusts, " ever learning, and yet never able to come to true knowledge of the truth. ${ }^{8}$ Now as Jannes and Jambres withistood Moses, so do these also withstand the truth : men corrupted in their minds, reprobate concerning the faith. ${ }^{9}$ Howbeit they shall not make further advance ; for their folly shall be fully manifest unto all men, as theirs also was.
2. Lovers of money] Comp. Auth. in I Tim. vi. 10; 'covetous,' Auth. and all the Vv. Haughty] 'Proud,' Auth. and all the $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$. The term $\boldsymbol{j}_{\pi \epsilon \rho-}$ ńфavoz coupled with the climactic character of the context, scems to mark not only pride, but the 'strong mixture of contempt for others' which is involved in 'haughty;' see Crabb, Synon. p. 64.
3. Implacable] 'Truce breakers,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Wicl., Coverd. (Test.), Rhem., ' without peace.'
Slanderers] So Auth. in 1 Tim. iii. 11 : 'false accusers,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Wicl., 'false blamers;' Coverd. (Test.), Rhem., 'accusers.'
Savage] 'Fierce,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Wicl., 'unmylde;' Coverd. (Test.), Rhem., 'unmerciful.'
Haters of good] ' Despisers of those that are good,'Auth., and very sim. the other Vv. except Wicl., Rhem., 'with out benyngnyte; ' $\operatorname{Cov}$. (Test.), 'without kynd'nesse.'
4. Besotted with pride] 'Highminded,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Wicl., 'bollun with proude thoughtis; ' Coverd. (Test.), Rhem., 'puft up;' see notes on 1 Tim. iii. 6.
5. Outward form] 'Form,' Author., Bish. ; 'the liknesse,' Wicl. ; 'a simili-
tude,' Tynd., Cran., Gen.; 'a slyyne,' Cov. (both) ; 'an appearance,' Rhem.
Such] So Auth., rightly omitting 'and' (as in Tynd., Cran., Gen.), the ascensive kal joined with rovizous giving the pronoun approximately that meaning.
6. Of these] So Wicl., Rhemish: ' of this sort,' Auth., Tynd., Coverd., Cranm., Genev.; ' of them,' Cov. (Test.); 'these are they,' Bish.
7. Yet never] 'Never,' Auth. and all the other Vv. True knowlcalge] 'The knowledge,' Auth. and all Vv. except Wicl., 'the science.' Here the antithesis seems to suggest the stronger translation of $\bar{\pi} \pi\{\gamma \omega \omega \sigma s$; see above, notes on ch. ii. 25.
8. Withstand] 'Resist,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Wicl., 'agenstoden.' Corrupted in their, etc.] 'Of corrupt minds,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Wiclif, 'corrupt in undirstondinge;' Cov. (Test.), 'of corrupte mind;' Rhem, ' corrupted in mind.'
9. Howbeit] 'But,' Auth.

Not make, etc.] 'Proceed no. further,' Author. ; 'schuln not profite,' Wicl.; 'prevayle no lenger,' Tynd., Cov., Cran., Genev., Bish.; 'farther shall they not profit,' Cov. (Test.)'; 'prosper no further,' lihem. Fully manifest]
${ }^{10}$ But thou wert a follower of My doctrine, manner of life, purpose, faith, long-suffering, love, patience, ${ }^{11}$ persecutions, sufferings, - such sufferings as happened unto me at Antioch, at Iconium, at Lystra; such persecutions as I endured : and yet out of them all the Lord delivered me. ${ }^{12}$ Iea, and all that will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution. ${ }^{13}$ But evil men and impostors shall make advance toward the worse, deceiving and being deceived. ${ }^{14}$ But thou, continue in the things which thou learnedst and wert assured of, knowing of whom thou didst learn them; ${ }^{15}$ and that from a very child thou knowest the holy scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus. ${ }^{16}$ Every scripture inspired by God is also profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for discipline
'Manifest,' Auth., Rhemish; 'schal be
knowun,' Wicl.; 'shal be uttered,' Tynd., al.
10. Wert a follower] * 'Hast fully known,' Auth.; 'hast getun,' Wicl.; 'hast sene the experience of,' Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen. ; ' hast attayned unto,' Cov. (Test.), and very sim. Rhem.; ' 'hast followed,' Bish.

Love] So
all the $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{V}}$ except Auth., ' charity;' see notes on 1 Tim. i. 5.
11. Sufferings] So Cov. (Test.) : 'afflictions,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Wicl., Rhem., 'passions.
Such sufferings, etc.] Similarly Coverd. (Test.), 'such as happened unto me:' 'which came unto,' Author., Bish.; ' which happened unto,' Tynd. and remaining $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$.

Such persecutions as] 'What persecutions,' Auth.; 'what maner persecuciouns,' Wiclif, Coverd. (Test.), Rhem. (' manner of'); 'which persec.,' Tynd. and remaining Vv. And yel] 'But,' Auth. and the other V v. except Wicl., 'and.'
13. Impostors] So Conyb. : ‘seducers,' Author., Rhem. ; 'deceyuers,' Wicl. and remaining $V_{\mathrm{V} \text {. except }}$ Cov. (Test.), 'miscariers:' 'deceivers' is appy. the most satisfactory transl. (see notes), but some change seems required on account of
$\pi \lambda a v \omega ิ \nu \tau \epsilon s . \quad$ Tynd., Cran., Gen., retain. 'deceive' in both clauses.
Shall make advance, etc.] 'Shall wax worse and worse,' $A u t h$. and the other Vr. except Wicl., 'encrees into wors ;' Rhem., 'shall prosper to the worse.'
14. Thou, continue] So Rhem.: 'continue thou,' Auth, and the other Vv. except Wicl., 'dwelle thou.'
Learnedst] 'Hast learned,' Auth. and all the other $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$. Wert assured] 'Hast been,' Author.; 'that ben bitakun to thee,' Wicl. ; 'were committed unto the,' Tynd., Cov., Cranm., Bish.; 'are comm. unto thee,' Coverd. (Test.), Gen., Rhem.
Didst learn] 'Hast learned,' Auth. and all the other $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{r}}$.
15. A very child] 'A child,' Author.; 'fro thi yungethe,' Wicl., Cov. (Test.); ' of a child,' Tynd., Cov., Cran., Genev.; 'an infant,' Bish.: ' from thine infancie,' Rhem. Thou knowest] 'Hast known,' Auth.
16. Every scripture] 'All scripture,' Auth., Tynd., Gen., al.; ' the whole scr.,' Gen. Inspired by God, etc.] Sim. Wicl., Rhem., ' onspirid of God, is, etc.:' ' is given by inspiration of God and, etc.,' Auth., Gen., Bish.; 'geven by insp. of God, is profitable,' Tynd.,

Which is in righteousness ; ${ }^{17}$ that the man of God may be complete, thoroughly furnished unto all good works.

## CHAPTERIV.

I solemnly charge thee before God, and Christ Jesus who shall hereafter judge the quick and the dead, and by His appearing and by His kingdom ; ${ }^{2}$ preach the word ; be attentive in season, out of season ; confute, rebuke, exhort, with all longsuffering and teaching. ${ }^{3}$ For the time will come when they shall not endure the sound doctrine ; but after their own lusts they shall heap up to themselves teachers, having itching ears; ${ }^{4}$ and they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall turn themselves aside unto fables. ${ }^{5}$ But do thou be sober in all things, suffer afflictions, do the work of an evangelist, fulfil thy ministry. ${ }^{6}$ For I am already being poured

Cov., Cran.; 'beynge insp. of heauen is,' Cov. (Test.). Discipline, etc.] 'Instruction in,' Auth., Bish.; 'to lerne in,' Wicl. ; 'to instruct in,' Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen., Rhem. ; ' to enfourme in, ${ }^{\prime} \mathrm{Cov}$. (Test.).
17. Complete] 'Perfect,' Auth. and all the other Vv .

Chapter IV. 1. Solemnly charge] 'Charge,' Auth.; ' witnesse,' Wicl.; ' testifie,' Tynd. and remaining $\nabla_{\mathrm{v}}$; ; compare notes on 1 Tim. v. 21 (Transl.).
Thee] Auth. adds *' therefore.?
Christ Jesus] * 'The Lord Jesus Christ,' Auth.

Shall hereafter]
'Shall,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Cov., which apparently endeavors to distinguish between $\mu$ ét $\lambda$ дovtos and a common future by ' which shall come to.'
And by His, etc.] * 'At his, etc.,' Autth. And by His] 'And his,' Auth.
2. Altentive] 'Instant,' Auth., Bish., simil. Rhemish, 'urge;' ' be thon bisy,' Wicl. ; 'be fervent,' Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen.; ' be earnest,' Cov. (Test.).
Confute] 'Reprove,' Auth., Wicl., Cov. (Test.) ; Tynd. and the remaining $V_{\mathrm{V} .,}$,
'improve.'
Teaching]
' Doctrine,' Auth.; see notes.
3. Shall not] So Cov. (both), Bish.: ' will,' Auth. and remaining Vv. It seems desirable to preserve 'shall' throughout ver. 3 and 4, as there is no apparent reason for the change. We now should probably use 'will' throughout; the 'usus ethicus,' however, which is said to limit the predictive 'shall' to the first person, was unknown to our Translators ; comp. Latham, Eng. Lang. § 521 (ed. 4).

The sound] 'Sound,' Auth. They shall heap up] 'Shall they,' Auth., following all the other $\mathrm{Vv}_{\mathrm{v}}$., some of which, however (Tynd., Cov., Cran.), by adopting slightly different constructions, make the inversion more natural.
4. Turn themselves, etc.] 'Be turned,' Auth., Cov. (Test.), Cran., Bish.; 'thei schuln turn,' Wicl.; 'be geven,' Tynd., Cov., Bish.; 'be converted,' Rhem.
5. Do thou, etc.] 'Watch thou,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Wicl., 'wake thou: ' Rhem., 'be thou vigilant.'
Suffer] So Tynd., Coverd., 'Cran., Gen., Bish.: 'cndure,' Auth. ; 'traueil,' Wicl.;
out, and the time of my departure is at hand. ${ }^{7}$ I have striven the good strife, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith. 8 Henceforth there is laid up for me the crown of rightcousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give me in that day; and not to me only, but unto all them also that love His appearing.
${ }^{9}$ Use diligence to come shortly unto me: ${ }^{10}$ for Demas hath forsaken me from love of the present world, and is gone unto Thessalonica ; Crescens to Galatia, Titus unto Dalmatia. ${ }^{11}$ Only Luke is with me. Take Mark, and bring him with thee: for he is serviceable to me for ministering. ${ }^{12}$ But Tychicus I sent to Ephesus. ${ }^{13}$ The cloak that I left at Troas with Carpus, when thou comest, bring with thee, and the books, especially the parchments. ${ }^{14}$ Alexander the coppersmith showed me much ill-treatment: may the Lord reward him according to his works. ${ }^{15}$ Of whom be thou ware also ; for he greatly withstandeth our words.
'‘ labour,' Cov. (Test.), Rhem.
Fulfil] So Wicl. and all the Vv. except Auth., 'make full proof of.'
6. Already being, etc.] 'Am now ready to be offered.' Auth, and the other Vv. except Wicl., 'I am sacrificed now ;' Cov. (Test.), 'I am now offred.'
7. Striven the good, etc.] So Wicl.: 'fought the good fight,' Auth., and similarly all the other Vv. ('a good') ; compare notes on 1 Tim. vi. 12 (Transl.).
8. The] 'A,' Auth. and all Vv.

In] Wicl., Coverd. (both), Rhem.: 'at,' Auth. and the remaining $V \mathrm{v}$.
9. Use diligence] 'Do thy diligence,' Auth., Cran., Bish.; 'high thou,' Wicl.; ' make spede,' Tynd., Cov., Gen. ; ' make hast,' Cov. (Test.), Rhem.
10. From love of] 'Having loved,' Auth., Bish.; 'louynge,' Wicl., Coverd. (Test.), Rhern. ; ' and hath loved,' Tynd.; 'and loveth,' Cov., Cran.; 'and hath embraced,' Gen. Is gone] So Cov. (Test.), Rhem. : 'is departed,' Auth., Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen., Bish.; 'went,' Wicl. On reconsideration it would seent that the purely aoristic translations 'forsook - went' (ed. 1) throw
the events too far backward into the past.
As the desertion appears to have been recent, our idiom seems here to require the use of the auxiliaries. In verse 16 the case is different: there the epoch is defined in the context.
The present] 'This present,' Auth. and all Vv. except Wicl., Cov. (Test.), Rhem., 'this.'
11. Serviceable] As in ch. ii. 21 : 'profitable,' Auth., Wicl., Cov. (both), Cran., Bish., Rhem. ; 'necessary;' Tynd., Gen. For ministering] Sim. Tynd., Gen., 'for to minister:' 'for the ministry,' Auth., Rhem.; 'in to service,' Wicl.; 'for the ministracion,' Cov. ('to the'), Cranm., Bish.; 'in the service,' Cov. (Test.).
12. But] So Rhem.: ' and,' Author., Tynd., Cranm., Gen., Bish. ; 'forsothe,' Wicl.; Cov. (both) omit.
I sent] So Wicl., Cov. (Test.) : 'have 1 sent,' Auth. and the other Vr. except Rhem., 'I have,' etc.
13. Especially] So Rhem.; 'but especially,'Auth. and all the remaining Vv .
14. Showed me, etc.] Similarly Wicl., Coverd. ('Test.), 'schewid to mo nuyche yuel,' and Bish., Rhem., 'shewed me,'
${ }^{16}$ At my first answer no man stood forward with me，but all men forsook me ：may it not be laid to their charge．${ }^{17}$ But the Lord stood by me，and gave me inward strength ；that by me the preach－ ing might be fulfilled，and that all the Gentiles might hear ：and I was delivered out of the lion＇s mouth．${ }^{18}$ The Lord shall deliver me from every evil work，and shall save me into His heavenly king－ dom：to whom be glory for ever and ever．Amen．
${ }^{19}$ Salute Prisca and Aquila，and the household of Onesiphorus． ${ }^{20}$ Erastus remained at Corinth：but Trophimus I left sick at Mi－ letus．${ }^{21}$ Use diligence to come before winter．Eubulus greeteth thee，and Pudens，and Linus，and Claudia，and all the brethren． ${ }^{2}$ The Lord Jesus Christ be with thy spirit．Grace be with you．
etc．：＇did me much evil，＇Auth．，Tynd．， Cov．，Cran．，Bish．；＇hath done，＇Gen． May reward］＇Reward，＇Auth．
15．（İreatly］＇Hath greatly，＇Author．， Cran．，Bish．；＇dyd grently，＇Cov．（Test．）： the rest omit the auxiliary．
Withstandeth $\}$＇Withstood，＇Auth．
16．Stood forward with］＇Stood with me，＇Auth．；＇helpid，＇Wicl．；＇assisted，＇ Tynd．，Coverd．，Cranm．，Gen．，Bish．，and sim．Cov．（Test．），－by no means an in－ appropriate translation ；＇was with me，＇ Rhem．May it，etc．］Sim． Wicl．，Rhem，＇be it not：＇＇I pray God that it may not，＇Auth．and the remain－ ing $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$ ．
17．But］So Wicl．，Coverd．（Test．）， Rhem．：＇notwithstanding，＇Auth．and the remaining Vv ．The translation of these latter $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{V}}$ ．is perhaps slightly too strong for the simple $\delta$ 白．
By me］So Cov．（both）：＇with me，＇ Auth．；＇stoode to me，＇Rhem．；＇helpid，＇ Wicl．；the rest，＇assisted．＇
Gave me inward］As in 1 Tim．i．12： ＇strengthened，＇Auth．and the other $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{V}}$ ． except Wicl．，Cov．（Test．），＇connfortid．＇ Fulfilled］As in ver． 5 ；so Cov．（Test．）， and similarly Tynd．，Cov．，Cran．，Gen．， Bish．，＇should be fulfil．to the utmost：＇
＇fully known，＇Auth．；＇be fillid，＇Wicl．； ＇be accomplished，＇Rhemish．As Auth． and all the $V_{v}$ ．have＇by＇in connection with this verb，and as this prep．appears formerly（as indeed not uncommonly at present）to have been used as equivalent to＇by means of，＇no change has been made．The lion＇s mouth］So $\operatorname{Cov}$. （Test．）：＇the mouth of the lion，＇ Auth．and all the other $\mathrm{Vv}_{\mathrm{v}}$ ；see notes．
18．The Lord］＊＇And the Lord，＇Auth． Shall save me unto］Similarly Wicl．，Cov． （Test．），＇schall make me eaaf in to ：＇ ＇will preserve me unto，＇Author．，Bish．； ＇shall kepe me unto，＇Tynd．，Cov．，Cran．， Gen．；＇will save me unto，＇Rhem．Per－ haps the very pregnant expression $\sigma \dot{\text { ós }}$ 与ढ tis may permit this literal translation．
20．Remuined］So Rhem．，and simil． Cov．（Test．），＇did rem．：＇＇abode，＇Auth． and the remaining $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$ ．
I left，etc．］＇Have I left at M．sick，＇Auth． Miletus］So Cov．（Test．），and similarly Wicl．，＇Mylete：＇Auth．and all the rest， ＇Miletum．＇
21．Use dil．］＇Do thy diligence，＇$A$ uth．， Cran．，Bish．；＇high thou，＇Wicl．；＇make spede，＇Tynd．，Gen．；＇make hast，＇Cov． （Test．），Rhem．

22．Auth．adds＊＇Amen。＇

## TIIE EPISTLE TO TTTUS.

## CHAPTERI.

PAUL, a servant of Goch, and an apostle of Jesus Christ, for the faith of God's elect and the knowledge of the truth which leadeth unto godliness ; ${ }^{2}$ upon the hope of eternal life, which God that cannot lie promised before eternal times, ${ }^{3}$ but made manifest in His own seasons His word in the preaching, with which I was intrusted according to the commandment of our Saviour God; ${ }^{4}$ to Titus, my true child after the common faith. Grace and peace from God the Father and Christ Jesus our Saviour.
${ }^{5}$ For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldest further set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain elders in every

Chapter I. 1. For] Similarly Tynd., Coverd., Gen., 'to preach the faith;' 'according to,' Auth and remaining Vv. except Wicl., 'bi the.'
Knowledge] So Tynd., Cov. (both), Cran., Bish., Rhem.: 'acknowledging,' Authr, Gen.; 'knowinge,' Wicl.
Leadeth unto] So Cov.: 'is after,' Auth., Wicl., Tynd., Cran., Bish. ; ' accordyng to,' Cov. (Test.), Gen., Rhem.
2. Upon the] So Tynd., Cov.: ' in,'Auth., Cran., and Bish. ('the'); 'in to the,' Wicl., Cov. (Test.); Rhem. ; 'unto the, Gen. Eternal times] Sim. Cov. (Test.), 'everlastynge times :' 'world began,' Auth., Tynd., Cran. Gen., Bish.; ' of the world,' Wicl., Cov.; 'secular times,'Rhem.
3. Made manifest] Similarly Bish., ' hath made man :' 'hath....manifested,' Auth., Rhem. ; 'hath schewid,' Wicb., Cov. (Test.); 'hath opened,' I'ynd. and
remaining $V \nabla$. In the] Sim. Wicl., Rhem., 'in:' 'through,' Author. and the remaining Vv. except Coverd. (Test.), 'by the.'

With which, etc.] 'Which was committed unto me,' Author, and the other Vv. except Wicl., 'is bitakun to me.'
Our Saviour God] So Rhem.: Auth. and the remaining $\mathrm{VV}_{\text {., ' God our Saviour;' }}$ see notes on ch. iii. 4.
4. My true child] 'Mine own son,' Auth.; ' most dereworthe sonne,' Wicl.; 'his natural sonne,' Tynd., Cran. ; 'my natural son,' Cov. ; 'my dear son,' Cov. (Test.) ; 'his naturall sonne,' Cran.; 'a natural sonne,' Bishops; ' my beloued sonne,' Rhem. Grace] Auth. adds * 'mercy,' omitting kal.
Christ Jesus] * 'The Lord J. C.,' $\Delta u t h$.
5. Further set, etc.] 'Set in order,' Auth.; 'amende,' Wicl. ; 'performe,'
city, as I gave thee directions ; ${ }^{6}$ if any be under no charge, a husband of one wife, having believing children, not accused of dissoluteness, or unruly. ${ }^{7}$ For a bishop must be blameless, as being God's steward; not self-willed, not soon angry, not fieree over wine, no striker, not greedy of base gains ; ${ }^{8}$ but a lover of hospitality, a lover of goodness, soberminded, righteous, holy, temperate : ${ }^{9}$ holding fast the faithful word according to the teacling, that he may be able both to exhort by the sound doctrine and to refute the gainsayers.
${ }^{10}$ For there are many unruly vain talkers and inward deceiv-

Tynd., Cov. ; 'refourme,' Cranm., Bish., Zhem. ; 'redresse,' Cov. (Test.), Gen. Gave thee dir.] 'Had appointed thee,' Auth., Cran., Bish.; 'also I disposid to thee,' Wicl.; 'appointed thee,' Tynd., Cov., Gen. ; 'have app.,' Cov. (Test.) ; 'also appointed,' Rhem.
6. Under no, etc.] 'Blameless,' Auth., Cov., Cran., Bish.; 'withouten cryme,' Wicl., Rhem. ; 'fautelesse,' Tynd., Gen.; ' without blame,' Corr. (Test.).
A husband] So Wicl., 'an:' 'the husband,' Auth. and all the other Vv.
Believing] 'Faithful,' Auth. and all the Vv. Dissoluteness] 'Riot,' Auth. and all the other VV. except Wicl., ' leccherie.'
7. A Bishop] The idiom of our language seems only to admit of two translations, either 'a bish.' or 'every bish.;' the former is adopted by all the Vv.
As being, etc.] Similarly Gen., 'as it becommeth God's steward:' 'as the steward of God,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Wicl., 'a dispensour of God;' ' the minister of God,' Tynd.
Fierce over] 'Given to,' Auth., Coverd., Bish., Rhem. ; 'not drunkenlewe,' Wicl.; 'no dronkarde,' Tynd., Cov. (Test.) ; ' geven to moch w.,' Cran., Gen.
Greedy of, etc.] 'Given to filthy lucre,' Auth., Tynd., Cran., Gen., Bish.; ' coueitous of foule wynnyngre,' Wicl.; 'gredye of filthye lucre,' Cov. ; 'desirous of
f. 1.,' Coverd. (Test.) ; 'couetous of f. 1,' Rhem.
8. Goodness] So Tynd., Cov., Cranm., Gen., Bish.: 'good men,' Author. ; 'benyngne,' Wicl.; 'gentle,' Cov. (Test.), Rhem. Soberminded] So Tynd., Cov. : 'sober,' Author, and the remaining Vv. except Gen., 'wise.' Righteous] So Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen., and Auth., in 1 Tim. i. 9, 2 Tim. iv. 8: here Auth., Wicl., Rhem., 'just.'
9. According to, etc.] Similarly Covi. (Test.), 'which is acc. to the doctrine,' and Bish., Rhem. (omit 'the'): 'as he hath been taught,' Auth.; 'in holsum techynge,' Wicl:; ' the true worde of doctr.,' Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen.
Both to exhort, etc.] 'By sound doctrine both to exhort and to,' etc., Auth. Most of the Vv . only translate one ral; Gen., 'also to exhort by, etc.....and to.'
Refute] 'Convince,' Auth.; 'repreue;' Wicl., Rhem. ; 'improve,' Tynd., Cran., Gen.
10. Unruly] Auth. adds 'and; 'so all the other VV. : comp., however, Scholef, Hints, p. 125. Vain talkers] So Auth., and similarly Coverd., Tynd., Cranm., Gen. ; 'vain babblers' would have been more in conformity with 1 Tim. i. 6 , but a change is scarcely necessary.

Inward deceivers]
Similarly Tynd., Coverd., Cranm., Gen., Bish., 'disceavers of myndes:' 'deceiv-
ers, specially they of the circumcision: ${ }^{11}$ whose mouths must be stopped, seeing they overthrow whole houses, teaching things which they should not, for the sake of base gain. ${ }^{12}$ One of themselves, even a prophet of their own, said, The Cretians are always liars, evil beasts, slothful bellies. ${ }^{13}$ This witness is true. For which cause refute them sharply, in order that they may be sound in the faith; ${ }^{14}$ not giving heed to Jewish fables and commandments of men that turn themselves away from the truth.
${ }^{15}$ For the pure all things are pure : but for them that are defiled and unbelieving there is nothing pure ; but both their mind and their conscience is defiled. ${ }^{16}$ They profess that they know Gool; but in their works they deny Him, being abominable, and disobedient, and unto every good work reprobate.
ers,' Auth., Wicl., Cov. (Test.), Rhem.
11. Seeing they, etc.] 'Which subvert,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Tynd., Cov., Cran., 'which pervert.' It seems desirable to preserve the more exact translation of oítives and the simpler transl. of àvaт $\rho$ érovaty adopted by Auth. in 2 Tim. ii. 18.

Should not]
'Ought not,' Auth. and all the Vv. ex'cept Wicl., 'it bihoueth not.'
For the salce of, etc.] 'For filthy lucre's sake,' Auth., Bish.; 'for the loue of foule wynnynge,' Wicl.; 'because of filthy lucre,' Tynd., Cou. (both), Cran., Gen. ; 'for filthy lucre,' Rhem.
12. Slothful] So Rhem.: Auth. and all the remaining $\mathrm{Vv}_{\mathrm{v}}$, 'slow.'
13. For which cause] Similarly Wicl. ('what'), Rhem. (' the which'): Auth. and the remaining Vv., 'whercfore.'
Refute] 'Rebuke,' Author. and all the other Vv. except Wicl., 'blame.'
In order that] 'That,' Auth. and all the other Vv.
14. Turn themselves, etc.] Similarly Cov., 'which tourne them away,' etc., and so Wicl. and Rhem., 'auerting themselves from:' 'that turne from,' Auth., Tynd., Cov., Gen. ; ' that turne away the
trueth,' Cran. The translation, owing to the absence of the article, is not critically exact (sce notes) ; a second participle, however, as in Cov. (Test.), Bish., 'turning from,' and Rhemish (above), seems here so awkward that in this particular case we may perhaps acquiesce in the insertion of the rclative. If there be any truth in the distinction between 'that' and 'which' alluded to in the notes on Eph. i. 23 (Transl.), the substitution of 'who' (Conyb.) for 'that' is far from an improvement.
15. For (bis)] 'Unto' (bis), Auth. and all the other Vv.; Wiclif and Rhemish ('to'). There is] So Cov.: ' is nothing,' Auth. and the remaining Vv. except Wicl., Rhem., 'nothing is.' Both] So Coverd., Tihem.: 'even,' Auth. and the remaining Vv. except Wicl. and Cov . (Test.), which omit the first $\kappa$ al. Their conscience] Auth. and all Vv. omit 'their,' but in Tynd., al., the clause is translated slightly differently, 'the very myndis and consciences of them.'
16. Their works] So Rhemish: 'in works,' Auth.; 'bi dedis,' Wicl.; 'with the dedes,' Tynd., Cov. (both), Cranm., Gen. ; 'with works,' Bish.

## CHAPTER II.

But do tHOU speak the things which become the sound doctrine: 2 that the aged men be sober, grave, discreet, sound in faith, in love, in patience. ${ }^{3}$ The aged women likewise, that in demeanor they beseem holiness, not slanderers, not enslaved to much wine, teachers of good things ; ${ }^{4}$ that they may school the young women to be loving to their husbands, loving to their children, ${ }^{5}$ soberminded, chaste, keepers at home, good, submitting themselves to their own husbands, that the word of God be not blasphemed.
${ }^{6}$ The younger men likewise exhort to be soberminded. ${ }^{7}$ In all

Chapter II. 1. Do thou] So Rhem.: 'speak thou,' Author. and all the other V v.

The sound] 'Sound,'
Auth., Rhem. ; 'holsum' (without art.), Wicl. and remaining $\mathrm{Vv}_{\mathrm{v}}$.
2. Discreet] So Cov., Tynd., Cranm., Gen.: 'temperate,' Auth.; 'prudent,'
Wicl. ; 'wyse,' Cov. (Test.), Rhem.; 'sober,' Bish. The usual translation 'soberminded' would perhaps here tend to imply a limitation of the preceding v $\quad$ фà (ous to 'sober' in the primary sense, which the present context does not seem to involve ; contrast 1 Tim. iii. 2, and see notes on that passage.
Love] 'Charity,' Auth.; see notes on 1 Tim. i. 5 (Transl.).
3. That in demeanor, etc.] 'That they be in behavior as becometh holiness,' Auth. and sim. Gen., Bish. (' in such beh.') ; 'in holi abite,' Wicl.; ' in soche rayment as becommeth holiness,' Tynd., Cran.; ' that they use holy apparel,' Cov. (Test.); 'that they shewe themselves as it becommeth,' etc., Cov.; 'in holy attire,' Rhem.
So Wicl., and also Auth. in 1 Tim. iii.
11 : Auth. (here), Tynd., Cov., Cranm., Gen., Bish., 'false accusers;' C'overd. (Test.), ' accusers;' ' il speakers,' Rhem. Enslaved] Similarly Tynd., 'seruynge:' 'given,' Auth. and the other Vv.
4. School] 'Teach the, etc., to be sober,' Author. ; 'monest thou yunge w.,' Wicl. ; 'to make the, etc., sobreminded,' Tynd., Bish. ; ' enfourme the etc. to be,' Cov.; ' that they teache wisdom,' Cov. (Test.), and sim. Rhemish ; 'that they teache honest thinges to make the, etc., sobreminded,'. Cran.; 'that they may instruct the, etc., to be, etc.,' Gen.
To be loving, etc.] 'To love their husbands, to love their children,' Auth., and sim. the other $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{V}}$. Change made to preserve the sequence of adjectives.
5. Sober-minded] ' To be discreet,' $\Delta u$ thor., Tynd., Cov. ; 'that thei ben prudent,' Wicl.; 'wyse,' Coverd. (Test.), Rhem.; 'that they be discreet, Gen.; 'discreet,' Bish.
Keepers at home] The transl. of Tynd., Cran., 'huswyfly,' deserves notice.
Submitting themselves] So Auth., Eph. v. 21 ; 'obedient to,' Author., and all $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{r}}$. except Wicl., Rhem., 'suget to.'
6. The younger] 'Young men,' Auth. and all the Vv. except Cov. (both), 'the young men.'
7. In all respects] 'In all things,' Auth. and the other $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$. except Cov., Tynd., Gen., 'above all thynges.'
Thy doctrine] Similarly 'the doctrine,' Cran., Bish.: 'doctrine,' Auth., Rhem.; ' techinge,' Wicl.; ' with uncorrupte doc-
respects showing thyself a pattern of good morks; in thy doctrine showing uncorruptness, gravity, ${ }^{8}$ sound discourse that cannot be condemned, that he that is of the contrary part may be ashamed, having no evil thing to say of us. ${ }^{9}$ Exhort bond-servants to submit themselves unto their own masters, in all things to be well pleasing to them, not gainsaying, ${ }^{10}$ not purloining, but showing forth all good fidelity; that they may adorn the doctrine of our Saviour God in all things.
${ }^{11}$ For the grace of God hath appeared, that bringeth salvation to all men, ${ }^{12}$ disciplining us to the intent that haring denied ungodliness and worldly lusts we should live soberly, righteously, and godly, in the present world; ${ }^{13}$ looking for the blessed hope and
trine,' Tynd., Cov., Gen.; 'Iearnynge,' Cov. (Test.).

Gravity] Auth. adds *'sincerity.'
8. Discourse] 'Speech,' Auth. ; all the other Vv., 'word.' A translation should be chosen which will not limit $\lambda$ d́roy too much to 'speech' in private life: sce notes. Us] * 'You,' Auth.
9. Bond-servants] As in Eph. vi. 5 : 'servants,' $\Delta u t h$. and all the other Vv. Submit thenselves] As in ver. 5: 'be obedient,' Auth.

In all things, etc.] 'And to please them well in all things,' Auth. ; 'in alle thingis : plesynge not,' etc., Wicl. ; ' and to please in all things,' Tynd., Cov. ; 'to be pleasynge them, etc.,' Cov. (Test.) ; 'and to please them in all things,' Cran., Gen., Bish.; 'in al things pleasing,' Rhem.

Gainsaying]
So Rhem, and Auth. (Marg.) : 'answering again,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Wicl., 'agenseiynge.'
10. Slowing forth] 'Shewing;' Auth. Wicl., Cov. (Test.), Bish., Rhem.; ' that they shewe,' Tynd., Cran., Gen.; 'to shewe,' Cov. Our Saviour God] So Tynd., Gen., Rhem.: 'God our Saviour,' Auth, and remaining Vv.
11. Salvation to all men] So Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen., Auth. (Marg.), and similarly Bish., 'healthful to all :' ' hath appeared to all men,' Author.; 'of God
oure Sauyour,' Wicl., Coverd. (Test.), Rhem. The slight inversion of clauses in the text is both to preserve the connection of $\sigma \omega \tau \dot{\eta} \dot{\eta} / o s$ with $\pi \hat{\alpha} \sigma t \nu \dot{\alpha} \nu \nu\langle\rho$., and also to leave é $\pi \epsilon \phi \alpha{ }^{2} \eta \eta$, as much as possible, in the prominent position it occupies in the original.
12. Disciplining us] 'Teaching us,' Auth., Cov. (Test.), Bish.; ' and taughte,' Wicl.; 'and teacheth,' Tynd., Coverd., Cranm., Gen.; 'instructing us,' Rhem. - Teaching by discipline,' would be perhaps a more easy translation (compare 1 Tim. i. 20) ; the verb, however, is occasionally used absolutely (as here) by some of our older writers, e. g. Shakspeare and Milton. To the intent, etc.] 'That denying,' Auth., Bish., Rhem. ; 'that we forsake,' Wicl.; 'that we shuld deny,' Tynd., Cor., Cran., Gen.; 'that we deny,' Cov. (Test.).
The present] 'This present,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Wicl., Cov. (both), and Rhem., which omit 'present.'
13. The blessed] So Wicl., Cov. (Test.), Rhem. : 'that blessed,' Auth. and the remaining Vv. And appearing, etc.] So Cov., Cran., Gen. ('notable app., etc.') Bish., Rhem. ('advent'), and similarly Wicl., Cov. (Test.), 'the comynge of the glorie :' 'the glorious appearing,' Auth., and similarly Tynd:, omitting ar-
appearing of the glory of our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ; ${ }^{14}$ who gave Himself for us, that He might ransom us from all iniquity, and purify unto Himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works. ${ }^{15}$ These things speak, and exhort, and reprove with all authority. Let no man despise thee.

## CHAPTER III.

Put them in mind to submit themselves to rulers, to authorities ; to be obedient, to be readly to every good work, ${ }^{2}$ to speak evil of no man, to be averse to contention, forbearing, showing forth all meekness unto all men. ${ }^{3}$ For we were once ourselves also foolish, disobedient, going astray, serving divers lusts and pleasures, living in malice and envy, hateful, hating one another. ${ }^{4}$ But when the kindness and the love toward man of our Saviour God appeared,
ticle. It is noticeable how our older $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$. have avoided a doubtful interpretation of the gen., into which even accurate scholars, like Green (Gramm. p. 215), have allowed themselves to be betrayed.
And Saviour] Similarly in sense Gen., 'which is of our Saviour:' 'and our So,' Auth., Cov. ('Test.), Bish., Rhem.; 'and of our S.,' Wicl., Tynd., Cov. (bat no preceding comma), Cran.
14. Ransom] 'Redeem,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Wicl., 'agenbie.'
15. Reprove] So Wiclif: 'rebuke,' Auth. and all the other $\nabla_{\mathrm{V}}$.

Chapter III. 1. Submit themselves to] So Cov., Tynd., Cran., Gen.: ' be subject to,' Auth., Wicl., Bish., Rhem. ; ' be obediente to,' Cov. (Test.).
To rulers, to auth.] 'Principalities * and powers,' Auth. ; 'princis and .powers,' Wicl., Cov. (Test.) ; 'rule and power,' Tynd., Cran., Gen., Bish.; 'prynces and to the hyer auctorite,' Coverd.; 'princes and potestates,' Rhem. The occasional use of the term 'principalities' in Auth., with reference to angelical orders, makes
a change desirable. To be obedient] Sim. Gen.,.' to obey:' 'to obey magistrates,' Auth.
2. Averse to contention] 'No brawlers,' Auth. ; 'not ful of chidynge,' Wicl. ; 'no fyghters,' Tynd., Cran., Gen., Bish.; 'no stryvers,' Cov. (both) ; 'litigious,' Rhem. Forbearing] 'But gentle,' Auth., Cranm., Bishops; 'but temperat,' Wicl.; 'but softe,' Tynd., Cov. (both), Gen.
Showing forth] As in 1 Tim. i. 16, al.: 'shewing,' Auth.
3. Were once] 'We ourselves also were sometimes, etc.,' Auth., and in similar order majority of $\mathrm{V} v$. Going astray] Sim. Wicl., Rhemish, 'erring:' 'deceived,' Auth., Tynd., Cran., Gen. Hating] 'And hating,' Auth.
4. When] So Wicl., Coverd. (Test.), Rhem.: 'after that,' Auth. and remaining $V$. The love toward man, etc.] So, as to order, Rhem.: 'love of God our Saviour toward man,' Author. Wicl. has here a singular translation, ' the manhed of, etc.'
Our Saviour God] So the other Vv. except Auth., Cov., 'God our Saviour.'
${ }^{5}$ not by works of righteousness which we did，but after His mercy IIe saved us，by the laver of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost ；${ }^{6}$ which He poured out upon us richly through Jesus Christ our Saviour ；${ }^{7}$ that being justified by His grace，we should become heirs of eternal life，according to hope．
${ }^{8}$ Faithful is the saying，and about these things I desire that thou make asseveration，to the intent that they which have believed Gord may be careful to practise good works．These things are good and profitable unto men．${ }^{9}$ But avoid foolish questions，and genealogies， and strifes，and contentions about the law ；for they are unprofita－ ble and vain．${ }^{10}$ A man that is an heretic，after a first and second

5．We did］So Wicl．，Rhem．，and sim． Tynd．，Cov．，Crani，Gen．，＇we wrought：＇ ＇we have done，＇Auth．，Coverd．（Test．）； ＇Which be in right，we oughte，＇Bish．
After］So Cov．：＇according to，＇Auth．， Cov．（Test．），Cran．，Bish．，Rhem．；＇bi，＇ Wicl．；＇of，＇Tynd．，Gen．
Laver］So Rhem．：＇washing，＇Author．， Wicl．；＇fountain，＇Tynd．，al．The com－ ma after＇regeneration，＇Author．，Tynd．， Cov．，Cran．，Gen．，is not found in Wicl．， Cov．（Test．），Bish．，Rhem．
6．Poured out upon］＇Shed on，＇Auth． and the other $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{V}}$ ．except Wiclo，＇schedde in to ；＇Coverd．（Test．），＇poured forth ；＇ Rhem．，＇poured upon us．＇
Richly］So Bish，，Auth．（Marg．）：＇abun－ dantly，＇Auth．，Tynd．，Cov．，Cran．，Gen．， Rhem．；＇plenteousli，＇Wicl．；＇plentyful－ ly，＇Cov．（Test．）．
7．Become］＇Be made，＇Auth．
Heirs of，etc．］So Cov．，and similarly，in respect of order，Tynd．，＂heirs of eternal lyfe，thorowe hope：＇＇heirs according to the hope of，etc．，＇Auth．，Coverd．（Test．）， Cran．，Gen．，Bish．；＇eeris bi hope of，＇ Wicl．；＇heires aecording to hope of，＇ Rhem．
8．Faithful is the saying］＇This is a faithful saying，＇Auth．，Bish．；＇a trewe word is，etc．，＇Wicl．；＇this is a true say－ ing，＇Tynd．，Cov．，Cran．，Gen．；＇it is a faythful worde，＇Cov．（Test．），sim．Ritem．
（＇saying＇）．About these things］Sim．all the other $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{V} \text { ．，＇＇of these }}$ things，＇except Author．，＇these things．＇ Desire］＇Will，＇Auth．，Wicl．，Cran．，Gen．， Bish．，Rhem．；＇wolde，＇Tynd．，Coverd． （both）．Make asseveration］ ＇Affirm constantly，＇Author．；＇conferme other，＇Wicl．；＇certifie，＇Tynd．，Cranm．， Gen．；＇speak earnestly，＇Cov．；＇strength－ en them，＇ $\operatorname{Cov.}$（ Test．）；＇confirm，＇Bish．； ＇avouch，＇Rhem． To the intent that］＇That，＇Author，and all the other $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{V} .}$ ：the addition in the text seems necessary to obviate misconception of the meaning． Believed God］So Tynd．，and sim．Wicl．，＇bel．to God：＇ Auth．，Tynd．，Cran，ul．，＇bel．in God．＇ May］＇might，＇Auth．
Practise］＇Maintain，＇Auth．，Gen．；＇to De abouen other，＇Wicl．；＇to go forwarde in，＇Tynd．，Cran．；＇excel in，＇Cov．（both）， Rhem．；＇shewe forth，＇Bish．
Are good，etc．］So Author．，but observe that in Rec．the reading is $\tau \grave{\alpha}$ кал⿱亠乂𧰨 к．$. \tau . \lambda$ ．， which should have been translated＇the things which are，etc．，＇compare Scholef． Hints，p． 128 （ed．3）．
9．Strifes，and contentions］＇Conten－ tions and strivings，＇Auth．All the Vv． except Wiclif，Tynd．，Coverd．，place a comma after $\check{\text { épets．}}$
10．A first］＇The first，＇Auth．，Tynd．， al．；＇oon and the second，＇Wicl．；＇once
admonition, shun; ${ }^{11}$ knowing that he that is such is perverted, and sinneth being self-condemned.
${ }^{12}$ When I shall send Artemas unto thee, or Tychicus, use diligence to come unto me to Nicopolis: for there I have determined to winter. ${ }^{13}$ Forward zealously on their journey Zenas the lawyer and Apollos, that nothing be wanting unto them. ${ }^{14}$ And let ours also learn to practise good works for the necessary wants, that they be not unfruitful.
${ }^{15}$ All that are with me salute thee. Salute them that love us in the faith.

Grace be with you all.
or twise admonition,' Gen.
Shun] Similarly Wicl., Coverd. (Test.), 'eschew' ['schenen']: 'reject,' Auth., Cron.; 'avoyde,' Tynd., Cov., Genev., Bish., Rhem. The translation of Auth., though lexic. tenable, appears stronger than the use of $\pi a p a l \tau \epsilon \bar{\sigma} \sigma \geqslant a t$ in these Eipp. will fully warrant ; see notes. The translation "r refuse,' 1 Tim. v. 11 (Author.), would not here be suitable, as the context affords no clew to the character of the refusal; the meaning is simply 'have nothing to do with,' 'monere desine;' see notes in loc.
11. Perverted] So Tynd., Cran., Gen.: ' subverted,' Auth., Wicl., Rhem.
Self-condemned] ' Condemned of himself,' Auth., sim. Bish.; 'dampned bi his owne dome,' Wiclif, and similarly Tyndal (' by his owne judgment'), and remaining Vv.
12. Shall send] So Auth. and nearly all $\mathrm{Vv}_{\mathrm{v}}$ : Coverd. (Test.), with scrupulous accuracy, 'shall have sent.' This latter translation, though perhaps critically exact, appears to have been very rarely adopted by our Translators (compare Matth. xxi. 40, Mark viii. 38, John iv. 25, xvi. 13, Acts xxiii. 35, Rom. xi. 27, 1 Cor. xvi. 3), and except where striat accuracy may be required, or where an idiomatic turn (as in 1 Tim. v. 11) adds
force and perspicuity, is best avoided, as not fully in accordance with our usual mode of expression. Use diligence] 'Be diligent,' Author., Tynd., Cran., Gen., Bish.; 'high thou to, etc.,' Wicl.; 'make spede,' Coverd.; 'make hast,' Cov. (Test.) ; ' hasten,' Rhern.
There I have] So Cov. (Test.), Rhem.: ' I have determined there,' Auth. and the remaining Vv.; 'dwelle in wynter there,' Wicl.
13. Forward zealously, etc.] 'Bring Z. etc.....on their journey diligently,' Auth., and in similar order, Tynd., Cov., Cran.; 'bisili bifor sende,' Wicl.; 'set forward ....carefully,' Rhem. : the rest mainly as Auth.
14. Ours] So Auth. and all Vv: except Rhem., 'our men.'
Practise] 'Maintain,' Auth.; 'excel in,' Tynd. and the other Vv. except Wicl., 'be governouris in;' Gen., 'exercise.'
The necessary wants] 'Necessary uses,' Author. and the other Vv . except Tynd., Cranm., Gen., 'as far forth as nede requyreth.'
15. Salute] So Coverd. (Test.), Rhem.: 'greet,' Auth., IVicl. (but 'grete' above), Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen., Bish. As the same word ( $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \pi d \oint \in \sigma \hat{\alpha} \alpha t)$ is used in both cases, a change seems scarcely desirable. All] Auth. adds * 'Amen.'
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[^0]:    I have now adopted this term, feeling convinced that the term 'Italic' is likely to mislead. The latter $I$ retained in the previous Epistles, as sanctioned by common usage ; I was, however, fully aware that the term 'vetus Itala' really belonged to a recension, and not to an independent version. In the present Epistles I have derived the Old Latin from the translation in that language as found in the Codex Claromontanus.

[^1]:    ${ }^{1}$ The fourth volume of the new edition of Horne's Introduction will show how conscientiously our countryman Dr. Tregelles has acted in this respect, and what pains 1.0 has taken to secure an accurate knowledge of versions in languages with which he himself did not happen to be acquainted.

[^2]:    ${ }^{1}$ This epithet must be considered as used subjectively. To me, who am unfortunately unacquainted with Arabic, this language has presented many difficulties. The Arabic scholar would very likely entirely reverse my judgment.

[^3]:    ${ }^{1}$ Some tinges of Arianism have been detected in this Version, c. g. Phil. ii. S, 'ni vulva rainnida risan sik galeilio [surely not a correct translation of 'toa] guba,' but are not suffciently strong to detract seriously from the general faithfulness of the Version.

    2 I regret that I cannot in any way agree with my valued acçuaintance Dr. Tregelles, in his judgment on the Ethiopic Version : in St. Paul's Epistles I have found it anything but 'the clreary paraphrase' which he terms it in his remarks in Horwe, Introduction, Vol. IV. p. 319.

[^4]:    1 It is said that Professor Bernstein has for some time been engaged in the preparation of a new Syriac Lexicon, but I cannot find out that it has yet appeared.
    2 See, however, preface to the Commentary on the Philippians. etc., p. vii.

[^5]:    1 The only passages, I belicve, in which any substantial change of opinion occurs are as follows, 1 Tim. vi. 4 (reading; $\notin \rho \in \iota s$ for ${ }^{\epsilon} \rho เ s$ ); vi. $10 ; 2$ Tim. i. 10 ; Tit. i. 2.
    2 I may here remark that all the references to Winer's Grammar bave been altered and couformed to the lamented author's 6th and last edition.

